

FBIS**DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS***Soviet Union*

Vol III No 055

21 March 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Commentators Examine NATO NPG Meeting in FRG	AA 1
Weinberger 'Pressuring' Allies	AA 1
[Drobkov in PRAVDA 18 Mar]	
Bogachev Views Meeting	AA 1
U.S. 'Stubbornly' Refuses to Match Test Ban	AA 2
[Zholkver]	
'Top Priority' Contrasts Security Concepts	AA 3
[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]	
'Serious Questions' Remain After CDE Session	AA 6
[Sychev in IZVESTIYA 20 Mar]	
'Unconstructive' UK Stance on Missiles Assailed	AA 8
[Stura in IZVESTIYA 19 Mar]	

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Communique	BB 1
[PRAVDA 21 Mar]	
CEMA Machine Building Session in Budapest Noted	BB 6

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

UN Secretary General Praises Soviet UN Activity	CC 1
Arbatov on Need for International Breakthrough	CC 1
[Sofia TRUD 11 Mar]	
USSR Deputy Minister Ilichev on Foreign Policy	CC 2
[Sofia NARODNA MLADEZH 25 Feb]	

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reaction Continues to Contra Aid Campaign, Vote	A 1
Reagan Broadcast Hit	A 1
[Gan in PRAVDA 18 Mar]	
Congress Rejects Aid	A 2
'Sharp Discontent' Noted	A 2
No-Confidence Vote Given	A 2
[Lyutyy]	
Lomeyko's 20 March Press Briefing Reported	A 3
Reportage on U.S. Activities in Mediterranean	A 4
Libyan Forces on Alert	A 4
Lomeko on Exercises	A 5
'Armed Provocation' Begins [Gan in PRAVDA 20 Mar]	A 5
Navy Actions Noted	A 6
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Mar]	
Agayants Comments	A 7
Aytmatov 'Not Hinting at CIA' in Palme Article	A 8
[Hastad in Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 17 Mar]	

Shultz Tour Aims to Pressure Greece, Turkey	A 8
Commentator Hits U.S. Warships' Visit to Karachi	A 9
U.S. Policy Toward Afghan Rebels Criticized	A 10
Meese Visit Scored	A 10
[IZVESTIYA 19 Mar]	
Shultz Assures Support	A 10
[Biryukov]	
Danger From Nuclear Carrying Spacecraft Noted	A 11
[Borisenko]	
USSR Canada Discuss Fishing Rights in Leningrad	A 12

SOUTH ASIA

Demichev Cited on Festival Accord With India	D 1
[PRAVDA 20 Mar]	
Demichev Departs	D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Australia Protests Planned U.S. Aid to 'Contras'	E 1
SRV Foreign Ministry Rejects Khmer Communique	E 1
Marcos Funding, Philippine Protests Reported [Myakota]	E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Shevardnaze Visit to Poland	F 1
Meets Soviet Activists	F 1
Warsaw TV Interview	F 1
Shevardnaze Departs	F 3
Jaruzelski Meets Pact Foreign Ministers in Warsaw	F 4
Mortenegro's Stefanovic Arrives in Moscow for Talks	F 4
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Mar]	
USSR, SFRY Sign 1986-1990 Cooperation Program	F 4
Moscow Meeting Marks Bulgarian Treaty Date	F 4
[PRAVDA 18 Mar]	

WESTERN EUROPE

Report on NATO Nuclear Planning Group Meeting [Serov, Sosnovskiy]	G 1
UK, FRG Reportedly Upset by U.S. Pressure on SDI	G 1
[Drobkov in PRAVDA 19 Mar]	
Kohl Yields to Pressure	G 2
UK 'Blindly Following' U.S. [Levin]	G 3
Zamyatin Reportedly Next Soviet Ambassador to UK	G 3
[PRESS ASSOCIATION]	
France's Chirac Faces Difficulties in New Government [Lopatin]	G 4
British Ambassador Cartledge Visits Uzbekistan	G 4
Albanian Government Demands UK Return Gold	G 4
Italian Business Spokesman on Joint Trade Outlook	G 5
[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]	
Soviet Envoy on Portugal, U.S. UNITA Ties	G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Economist Claims West 'Created' OPEC Crisis	H 1
---	-----

III. 21 Mar 86

3

SOVIET UNION

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Soviet Delegation Visits Venezuelan Congress
[IZVESTIYA 19 Mar]

K 1

Costa Rica Denies Soviet Extradition Request

K 1

COMMENTATORS EXAMINE NATO NPG MEETING IN FRG

Weinberger 'Pressuring' Allies

PM201035 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov article: "Pressure on the Allies"]

[Text] Pentagon chief C. Weinberger has departed the United States for Western Europe. The very office held by the visitor and his political positions leave no doubt that his trip is connected with a U.S. intention of overtly pressuring the NATO allies.

The visit is timed for the NATO Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) meeting in the FRG, planned for 20-21 March. Sessions of this group precede sessions of the North Atlantic bloc's military and political organs. They seem to be becoming the first lap in the NATO relay, on which the tone is set for the while "race." So the concern shown by the Pentagon, which is striving to influence its West European allies to prevent the slightest deviation from their orientation toward Washington on fundamental issues of war and peace, is no accident.

But Washington sees a threat of deviation in the fact that the constructive Soviet peace initiatives, approved by the 27th CPSU Congress, have forced many in the West to stop and think whether it is not better for mankind to cast off its deadly-dangerous burden of nuclear arsenals on the threshold of the next century. NATO's missile wor-shippers are even more alarmed by the fact that the USSR has proposed a specific, totally realistic plan to realize mankind's dream of lasting peace.

Washington, as is well known, has avoided giving a constructive response to the Soviet proposals. The American Administration has preferred to submerge the essence of the matter in various conditions and "linkages" blocking the way to a solution of the problem. In addition to this, a massive propaganda campaign has been launched with the aim of persuading mankind that it will supposedly never be able to do without nuclear weapons. Consequently, it is said, the United States cannot (Weinberger himself speaks openly on this) give up its nuclear weapon tests and intends to continue nuclear explosions. This stance embarrasses many of the U.S. NATO allies. Weinberger's task, observers believe, is to "dispel their alarm," that is, simply twist their arms.

Now, on the eve of the spring sessions of leading NATO organs, Washington is striving at all costs to secure a negative reaction from the North Atlantic bloc to any proposals capable of leading to restraint in the arms race or to arms reduction. The possibility cannot be ruled out that this time too pressure of this kind, backed up by the transatlantic emissary's visit, will force the NPG to vote once again in favor of increasing NATO's nuclear arsenal. But it is also clear that the West's stubborn reluctance to heed the voice of reason once again reveals to the peoples the dangerous actions of those forces which are trying to perpetuate the nuclear threat hanging over mankind.

Bogachev Views Meeting

LD201924 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev: Washington is going to respond to the appeal of the leaders of six countries, which asked the Soviet Union and the United States to refrain from all nuclear tests till the next summit meeting, with a nuclear blast this April.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, who arrived in West Germany to attend another meeting of NATO's nuclear planning group, said to British television: "As long as we have to rely on nuclear weapons, they will have to be tested."

So, the U.S. Administration solemnly assures world public opinion that it is sincerely striving to render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete", but sees no better way to do that than by modernizing these weapons and augmenting their destructive power by means of nuclear testing.

A sophism? Undoubtedly. Nonsense? No, much worse. This is an unconcealed challenge to all mankind, disregard for the vital interests of the people for whom the Pentagon chief made his "explanations" and a mockery of their common sense.

It follows from the interview of Mr Weinberger, that the American delegation that arrived to attend the current meeting of NATO defense ministers in Wuerzburg is determined to stop short any possible talk about the United States joining the Soviet Union-announced moratorium on all nuclear blasts.

The American organizers of the meeting in Wuerzburg told newsmen that the session of the Nuclear Planning Group would discuss "disarmament issues." One can imagine what the Pentagon has in mind when it says "disarmament," considering the fact that the "prevention" of an arms race in space, Washington style, is a planned deployment of thousands of units of strike weapons, including nuclear system, in the near-earth space.

For many years now the leaders of West European countries who have to reckon with public opinion at home have been timidly trying to put in the communiqués issued at the end of the NATO gatherings their "special opinion" concerning the need of arms reduction by means of negotiations. Another such attempt will possibly be made at the Wuerzburg session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group. However, it has become a rule for Washington to brush off even the most modest wishes of its allies as regards the problems of war and peace.

There is every reason to believe that the current NATO defense ministers meeting will be no exclusion in this respect.

U.S. 'STUBBORNLY' REFUSES TO MATCH TEST BAN

LD201846 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] Already the initial reaction to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium appeal to the U.S. Congress proves that the question of putting a halt to nuclear tests has now become the focus of universal attention. Nor is this surprising; after all, if the USSR and the United States, which possess the largest nuclear arms stockpiles, were to renounce nuclear explosions, this would represent a most important step toward removing the threat of a nuclear conflagration in which the whole of mankind may perish. Why is it, then, that Washington stubbornly refused to follow our country's example? Our country has unilaterally refrained from carrying out nuclear tests for more than 7 months now, even though in the same period the United States has already carried out seven officially announced nuclear explosions. Up until recently, Washington made it appear as though everything was being held up by the problem of verification. However, scientists, including U.S. scientists, have proven that monitoring the halting of nuclear tests can be fully provided for through national means with the addition, where necessary, of on-site inspection.

The USSR for a long time now has been trying to persuade the United States to reach an accord concerning inspections of this kind and also to make use of the additional proposals of the six Delhi declaration signatory states. However, naturally enough, the point at issue here should revolve around monitoring the halting of nuclear explosions and not their continuation. And, in order to get nuclear arms tests banned, the USSR is ready for talks on any basis -- bilateral, trilateral, or multilateral. Thus, it is clearly not a matter of verification or the nature of the talks, it is a matter of the position taken by United States. And this position is determined by the interests of the U.S. military-industrial complex and of the so-called global strategy of the current U.S. Administration.

Setting forth this strategy in a recent message to Congress, President Reagan stated that U.S. participation in world affairs can no longer be confined to the defense of its national territory and that the United States pursues a global foreign policy. Military might is unequivocally proclaimed as the instrument of this policy.

Moreover, the White House and the Pentagon alike emphasize that nuclear arms were and remain one of the most important components of this military might. As for nuclear arms tests, these are certainly not carried out in order to verify their reliability, but for the purpose of intensifying their destructive properties, of modernizing them and creating new types, including their use in space. And U.S. military concerns receive enormous profits from all this.

However, one cannot fail to note something else: in the United States, including Congress, there is a growing number of sensible politicians who recognize the necessity of curbing the dangerous and ruinous nuclear arms race. And now, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium calls on Congress to do everything in its power so that the position of the United States, too, may correspond to the resolution of a most important task of our time: to put a halt to nuclear tests in the interests of ensuring stable world peace.

'TOP PRIORITY' CONTRASTS SECURITY CONCEPTS

LD181227 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 17 Mar 86

[Panel discussion on U.S. and USSR concepts of security hosted by Pavel Kuznetsov with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov, both from the Moscow United States of America and Canada Institute -- on the "Top Priority" program -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] Last week we discussed the Soviet concept of security outlined by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in the political report to the 27th Communist Party Congress in Moscow. The Soviet concept urges a new approach to security, saying it can be achieved only through political solutions, not through military ones, because the might of modern weapons is such that no military defenses, regardless of how powerful and sophisticated they may be deemed by their creators, will bring the desired protection. Also, security has to be mutual, there being no American security without that of the Soviet Union and vice versa, and in terms of international relations security has to be universal. Well, this being the case, my first question goes to you, Dr Bogdanov. In the White House they see no other way to get rid of nuclear weapons other than through building space defenses in the framework of the "star wars" program or, as it is officially known, the SDI. Well, I would like your opinion on this program.

[Bogdanov] Let me call your attention to one point. In our basics of the new universal international security system SDI takes very important place, in very negative sense, because our point of view is very clear and there is no changing that, which is if you have nuclear sword in the space you dictate your will to the rest of the world.

That's very simple, you know, that's why we are objecting to it very much. It's another side of the medal we have been discussing, of the medal of superiority. Do you agree with me, Sergey?

[Plekhanov] Of course, it's a new way of trying to achieve superiority for the United States. It's very clear. I mean, of course, in public statements from President Reagan we have heard the assertion that SDI is supposed to be a peace shield for the world, for the United States in the first place, but if you go and read the statements from the people who are involved in the technical details of the program, statements from the Pentagon officials, from the scientists involved, it becomes clear that what they have in mind is something much more sinister than that. It's simply buttressing the American offensive potential, the nuclear missile potential of the United States with an antimissile shield for the United States which would make it much easier for American defense planners to think in terms of delivering a first strike against the Soviet Union.

[Kuznetsov] Going back to security. We're speaking about security. The Americans, the White House, the people in the White House are also speaking about security and they're talking about it almost every day. So our concept is to phase out nuclear weapons, not to build space weapons, not to spend trillions of rubles or dollars, or whatever. The American concept of security is to build new weapons, space weapons, and at the same time there is work on the MX missiles, on the Trident II missiles; they are building more cruise missiles, they have been testing them all along in Canada and other places. There is great emphasis on new weapons, with the Midgetman and so on and so forth. In other words, we are faced with two radically opposed concepts of security. How do we overcome this contradiction, is there a mechanism, is there a body apart from the Geneva arms control talks to bridge gaps, to make our differences less obvious, less glaring?

[Bogdanov] Oh, yes. I believe that you have just mentioned all the points which are dividing us with the American concept of security, and in connection with that let me say something about our basics. Numbering one is military field, and in this military field how we perceive how it should be. So we have some very important points, that's my answer to your question. Points, the points which take into consideration the worries of the other (?side), (?by the way), it's not unilateral Soviet remedy. No, we take into consideration what the West is worrying about.

For instance, the point number one is our suggestion that we should refuse to go into nuclear war as a means of solving problems between states. Not only nuclear (?issues) but conventional too. It means that dealing with the nuclear arms we suggest to deal with the conventional arms in the way we are dealing with the nuclear arms. So it means that we are also for reducing them, not building up. We don't want dealing with nuclear arms to bring the arms race into the other (?field, conventional). No. We would like to deal together with both.

Number two, and that is very important, you know, ban on deployment of arms in (?the) space, cosmic striking arms, and at the same time moratorium on the test of all nuclear weapons, with the liquidation of them at the later stage. Then, then, the destruction of chemical weapons -- I mean principled ban on all means of massive destruction of people. If you look at that, you know, you will see that it covers the whole range of the ominous, you know, problems we have to face. Then we say that we at the same time we should strictly go into decreasing military potential of all the states under very strict control by all means.

[Kuznetsov] National, international and on site.

[Bogdanov] Oh, yes, and on-site inspection. So you have a very, very efficient combination of control. And then you (?dissolve) all the military [word indistinct] and then you start (?proportionally) decrease your military budget. And no I believe we should come to the political field of our basics, which are very closely connected to the military.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I agree. Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] Well, I'd like to comment on what Dr Bogdanov has just said. He mentioned the decrease of military budgets. Our listeners should not get the impression that we think that it's the last (?on the point). I mean, this thing could be put in the forefront.

[Bogdanov] Oh, yes, of course.

[Plekhanov] We don't mean that it's just a postponement of the (?alliances).

[Bogdanov] No, no, not at all, not at all.

[Plekhanov] Well, let's (?answer) the political area. It is, I think, a very important point which was made in the report by Comrade Gorbachev that this is a world which is undergoing rapid and dynamic changes. And there is a number of (?actors) in the international scene, I mean the governments, the states [words indistinct]. The number of (?actors is decreasing and so) this is a world system in which the politics based on -- the policies based on force will have less and less room. This is a world where one should get what it wants by means of accommodation, negotiations with the other, taking into account the legitimate interests of other states. This is a world, as Mr Gorbachev has emphasized, which is getting too small and too fragile for policies based on force. And therefore, the new international security system which we would like to see built on this planet involves very strict observance of the principle of respect of each nation to choose the ways and forms of its development. No one should impose its own blueprints and its own will on other states.

Another important point is fair political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts. It's very important to pay attention to what's going on in various regions of the world and those regional conflicts which go on in various parts of the world. They are very bad for international security. We are all for finding adequate and fair political solutions not solutions imposed from the outside but solutions which are based on the local interests, (?laws).

[Kuznetsov] Yes, this is important because the Americans -- Washington -- says that to make any progress in arms control we have to solve regional crises first, kind of making it conditional on arms control. I mean, either we solve or there is no progress in arms control. I mean, do you agree with this?

[Plekhanov] Well, in the first place I don't see why work can't be carried out in both areas, proceeding with arms control and proceeding with the solution of regional...

[Kuznetsov interrupting] ...without any conditions.

[Plekhanov] ...conflicts. Yes, without any conditions whatsoever. And in fact I think it could be turned the other way round. Without arms limitations, without measures to do something in the military area, the solution of regional conflicts becomes more difficult because there are far too many arms in the world.

[Kuznetsov] There are certain areas in which we see eye to eye with the United States. For example, the United States Administration agrees and has gone on record as saying that there can be no winner in a nuclear war. We fully agree with the statement but still there are wide differences.

[Plekhanov] There is another point on which theoretically we agree and that is the danger of terrorism. Comrade Gorbachev emphasized that we consider terrorism a very dangerous phenomenon and that measures, international measures, should be taken to combat terrorism because this is very important. But the problem is, that declarations may sound similar, but when you go into the way those declarations are or are not being implemented, that's where you see the difference.

[Kuznetsov] As President Reagan said, if you want peace prepare for war.

[Bogdanov] Yes, and we have another area of basics, you know, like economical, like humanitarian. We have no time to (?deliberate) on that but I also hope that we will have time. But I just would like to emphasize it's a comprehensive problem including economical and humanitarian problems and if you adopt basics you may come to the conclusion that it's a very good base for a dialogue between all the states and first of all members of the Security Council. Why? Because the responsibility for the security lies with the members of the Security Council. Not because that is their privilege, that is their responsibility. Then it is suggested in the report, very rightly, that why not five permanent members of the Security Council may not yet together to discuss all the human, world problems within the frames of that basic. I think it sounds very, very, very convincing and very promising.

[Kuznetsov] My last question to you, Dr Bogdanov. How do you see -- what is your impression of the Soviet concept of security? Do you believe that it can be realized, implemented, given certain differences and at times very wide differences with the United States?

[Bogdanov] You know, basically, unfortunately, I am a pessimist in the field of the present state of the Soviet-American relations but in this particular case I am more optimistic. You know why? Because all those basics are so appealing, so realistic that after all, Pavel, you know, nobody expected that they will be immediately accepted by USA, by the other countries. It's very good food for thinking, you know. It's a process. It may take some years or decade or so, but I believe that common sense -- and the American people is very famous for the common sense, you know that -- the common sense will prevail and the basics in one way or the other will become a universal, you know, form of cooperation and interaction between states. That's my belief.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, Dr Bogdanov, thank you, Dr Plekhanov. This is "Top Priority". I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Please join us a week from now for another edition of "Top Priority" from the North American service of Radio Moscow.

'SERIOUS QUESTIONS' REMAIN AFTER CDE SESSION

PM201445 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Sychev: "Who Is Delaying Work"]

[Text] Stockholm -- The latest session of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has ended in the Swedish capital.

What are the session's results? The 15 January 1986 statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the 27th CPSU Congress, which confirmed the Soviet state's unswerving desire to consolidate peace, had positive influence on its progress -- and this was noted in a number of speeches at the final plenary session.

At the session the USSR and the socialist countries again undertook vigorous actions to lead positive impetus to the conference's work and promote its successful completion. The socialist countries submitted in the working groups formulas for editing the final document, taking into account the positions and interests of their partners in the talks.

As is well known, the Soviet Union expressed the readiness to adopt the idea of a number of states on the mutual exchange of annual plans of military activity. The Polish delegation submitted detailed proposals for inviting observers.

Great activeness was displayed also by representatives of the neutral and nonaligned countries who sought to promote the search for and development of mutually acceptable decisions. Thanks to the efforts of the majority of those taking part in the conference definite dynamism was displayed in its work.

Nonetheless it must be noted that many serious questions remain unresolved. As is well known, the question of giving notification of naval activity in sea and ocean regions adjacent to Europe was a delaying factor.

To overcome this obstacle the Soviet Union put forward the proposal to examine right now questions of giving notification of the activity of ground forces and air forces and to carry out the naval forces to the next stage of the conference, stipulating this in a jointly drafted document.

But the NATO countries and above all the United States which throughout the conference opposed the navy being encompassed by confidence-building measures are also opposing the carrying over of this question. Where is the logic? What is this, an attempt to retain the deadlock? After all, it is perfectly obvious that without a gradual discussion of the problems work will eventually come to a halt not only in the field of notification but also in its connected aspects such as the exchange of annual plans in military activity and the invitation of observers.

Nonetheless, instead of a constructive reply the United States' bloc partners are trying to present the Soviet initiative as a refusal to give notification of naval activity. Failure to understand or unwillingness to understand? The USSR gave clear explanations: It is a case only of carrying over in accordance with the conference mandate, not of removing this complex problem from the conference table which, given the time, would make it possible to investigate it more carefully and find a solution according with the security interests of all. There can be no doubts that the activity of the ground forces, air forces, and navies throughout Europe and in adjacent sea and ocean regions and air space should be subject to notification.

The NATO countries' submission, after 2 years' silence, of their proposals for editing a document on the nonuse of force is as a whole undoubtedly a useful advance. But unfortunately their proposals still contain an attempt to emasculate the universality of the principle of the nonuse of force, to express it through the collection of military-technical confidence-building measures, and they discard the main provision -- the nonuse of military force, nuclear or conventional.

The NATO countries' attitude toward editing the document also puts us on our guard. They have in fact failed to alter their position on a single question. Their representatives inundated the working groups with depressing monotony with formulations taken from old proposals, many of which were rejected long ago or which are totally unacceptable. Is it not time to remove them and not to overload the talks with burdensome but futile debates?

Other examples can be cited of the NATO countries' blatantly unconstructive approach. "The coordination of the positions of 35 states with different political, economic, and social systems is, of course, no simple matter," special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy, the leader of the Soviet delegation, said. "We do not want to dramatize the situation. But the time has come to renounce futile attempts to achieve one-sided advantages, it is essential to embark on the settling of unresolved problems. That is the only guarantee of the conference's successful completion."

'UNCONSTRUCTIVE' UK STANCE ON MISSILES ASSAILED

PM201100 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua article: "Independence or Shortsightedness?"]

[Text] The other day THE WASHINGTON POST published an article which started somewhat enigmatically. The newspaper wrote: "Now that all the animals and gods of the super-powers' nuclear arsenals are well known the the entire world -- all those 'poseidons' and 'titans,' 'bisons, and 'bears' -- yet another terrifying arsenal has emerged: 'hades,' 'chevalines,' and 'plutos.'" What was it talking about? French and British nuclear arms. The newspaper noted with alarm that these countries' nuclear arsenals are "growing at a sensational pace."

In this instance the definition "sensational" is by no means sensational. It is wholly adequate and gives a realistic reflection of the heart of the matter. Here are facts drawn from Western sources concerning Britain. At this stage Britain has 64 Polaris nuclear warheads. In implementing its so-called "modernization" program, the British Navy is building a new submarine fleet, including 4 submarines equipped with 16 Trident missiles, each of which will carry 8 individually targetable warheads, and is equipping 4 submarines with 64 new Chevaline missiles carrying 2 warheads each. Construction of new nuclear-capable Tornado jet aircraft is also under way. As a result of the implementation of the program the British Navy will have 512 nuclear warheads and Britain's total nuclear potential will reach 1,088 warheads. But it is not just a question of quantity, even though the manyfold increase in the British nuclear arsenal is sufficiently noteworthy in itself. The fact is, as the newspaper THE GUARDIAN writes, that "Trident will create the potential for inflicting a first-strike against the Soviet Union and this opinion is backed up by the privately expressed opinions of the Americans, who know more about it."

Thus, the British Isles are gripped by a strong nuclear arms race fever. Why? Perhaps they are directly threatened by invasion? In no way, unless, of course, one includes the U.S. nuclear missile infrastructure in this invasion. So what is the matter? The official standard position of the Tory government is that Britain needs an "independent deterrent."

Here is yet another example of the famed British hypocrisy. It is particularly visible in the word "independent." The nuclear arms race that Britain has launched makes it even more dependent on the United States. I can back up that statement. Here are certain examples that by no means exhaust the line of argument. Trident missiles will be bought from the United States. Servicing and spares will be provided from U.S. bases in Kings Bay, Georgia.

The key aspects in the planning of British submarines will depend on the U.S. concern General Dynamics. The enriched uranium used as fuel on the submarines will be bought in the United States. Tests of the modernized Trident warheads will also be held in the United States -- in Nevada. But that is by no means all. Washington will have control of the systems for planning the trajectories and targeting the missiles themselves. This will be carried out by the U.S. joint strategic staff in Omaha, Nebraska using U.S. codes. Intelligence information will be obtained from U.S. spy satellites. (British submarines will depend on U.S. Navstar satellites to fix their position before missile launch. And access to these satellites is totally controlled by Washington.)

That is the background against which British Prime Minister Thatcher replied to the 15 January Soviet proposals. She described them, according to a Press Association report, as "unacceptable." Clearly, consistency is not one of the British premier's virtues. Quite recently Mrs Thatcher advocated removing Soviet medium-range missiles from Europe and urged that the question should not be linked with strategic and space arms. She even compared such a development with "the best Christmas present possible," stalling with a story about "Greeks bearing gifts." As Mrs Thatcher stated the other day in the House of Commons, her government refuses to freeze its nuclear arms and will continue to modernize them.

The key phrase in the British premier's speech was: "If a deterrent is not modernized it stops being a deterrent." Simple logic -- and the British have always been strong on logic -- says: If deterrents are eliminated on a mutual basis, there will be nobody left to deter or to be scared. Thatcher once welcomed the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Geneva, stating that they "hold out the hope of ensuring peace worldwide." But what did she and her cabinet do to implement that hope? Nothing apart from trying to clip its wings. What London calls "modernization" is actually the sabotaging of that hope.

London's negative and unconstructive position took many Britons aback and caused indignation in the broadest circles of the British public. THE GUARDIAN described it as a "fatal and cowardly act." With unconcealed irony it wrote that London "has decided that it likes the cruise missiles that have been deployed, and if they are taken away it will feel robbed." THE GUARDIAN's irony is all the more bitter because the "modernization" organized by Thatcher will cost British taxpayers 11 billion pounds sterling. Yet Britain is now spending more per capita on military purposes than any other West European NATO member. Britain's military budget has been growing nonstop for 7 years in succession.

But the threat to Britain's national security has been growing nonstop too -- and growing appallingly, to use Mrs Thatcher's terminology. Blocking the resolution of the disarmament problem in the diplomatic sphere, particularly in Europe, and whipping up the nuclear arms race in the military sphere, the British Tory Government is showing dangerous, if not criminal, shortsightedness. Not for nothing is it said that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

While the British public is expressing its discontent at Thatcher's negative position, the Pentagon, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, is "enthusiastically supporting her." The newspaper is by no means exaggerating. That was the spirit in which the statement by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant defense secretary, was couched the other day. Well, one can understand the Pentagon: An odd missile in the anti-Soviet arsenal or an odd wrench in the works of disarmament has never bothered it. Britain's national interests are another matter. As is well known the umbrella is a constant feature of a Briton's wardrobe, or rather, of his equipment. Now they want to turn this constant feature into a "nuclear umbrella." But whereas the first offers protection against rain, the second not only offers no protection against a nuclear downpour but might even provoke one. The best and most reliable means of avoiding this deadly downpour is to modernize thinking, not instruments of mass destruction.

WARSAW PACT FOREIGN MINISTERS COMMUNIQUE

PM201715 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 86 First Edition p 4

["Communique of a Session of the Warsaw Pact States Foreign Ministers Committee --
PRAVDA headline]

[Text] A routine session of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance was held in Warsaw 19-20 March 1986.

Taking part in the meeting were Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Petur Mladenov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic Peter Varkonyi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic Csar Fischer, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Polish People's Republic Marian Orzechowski, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Romania Ilie Vaduva, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Eduard Shevardnadze, and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Bohuslav Chnoupek.

1. The ministers exchanged opinions on the situation in Europe in light of the general state of international relations and the prospects for their future development. They placed on record the fact that the international situation remains tense and dangerous. Concern was expressed over the intensification of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and the actions being taken to extend it into space. The United States and its NATO allies are pressing ahead with the arms race in all directions. The unceasing deployment of American medium-range missiles in a number of West European countries causes serious alarm. The imperialist policy of force and of interference in other states' internal affairs continues. All this increases the danger of worldwide nuclear catastrophe, threatening the destruction of life on earth.

At the same time a real hope of changes for the better in the international arena has appeared thanks to the vigorous and purposeful actions of socialist states, and the faith of people in a peaceful future has been strengthened.

The ministers stressed that the peace proposals, set forth by the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty member-countries in Sofia in October 1985, are directed at carrying out the most urgent, cardinal task of our time -- to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, to stop the arms race, first of all the nuclear arms race, and to switch over to disarmament. The consistent, peace-loving policy of the Warsaw Treaty member-states opens up real possibilities for the attainment of these aims, for a constructive dialogue on the most pressing and burning problems of international relations.

The Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva created preconditions for a transition from the present state of confrontation to a normalization of relations between the USSR and the United States and for improving the international situation.

By the joint vigorous and persistent actions of governments and peoples, of all realistically thinking forces, it is possible to ensure a turn for the better in European and world affairs, a revival of the policy of detente and constructive cooperation.

The states represented at the meeting fully supported the program of fully liquidating all arsenals of nuclear and chemical arms before the end of this century and banning space strike arms set forth in the 15 January 1986 statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Stressing the very great importance of this program, they are determined to make every effort to carry it out. This would remove the threat hanging over mankind, lead to a radical improvement of the international situation, and provide an opportunity for doing away with weapons of mass destruction for good.

The Warsaw Treaty states insistently urge the NATO countries, above all the United States, Britain, and France, to display realism and responsibility with a view to reaching accords, taking into account the interests of both sides and all other states, concerning a radical reduction of nuclear weapons and their subsequent elimination and prevention of an arms race in space.

Elimination of weapons of mass destruction should be accompanied with an appropriate reduction of conventional arms and armed forces. The states represented at the meeting reaffirmed their principled position and proposals on matters of disarmament, stronger peace, and international security. They come out for strict observance of the principle of equality and identical security and for ensuring military balance at a lower level.

It was stressed that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting should center on questions connected with reaching concrete agreements on stopping the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, on earth and preventing it in space. At this meeting accords could be reached at least on questions of ending nuclear tests and eliminating American and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone.

It was stressed at the meeting that it is necessary for all states to strictly observe the principles of respect for national independence and sovereignty, nonuse of force or threat of force, inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, a peaceful settlement of disputes, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and other generally recognized norms of international relations.

2. The Warsaw Treaty states are most resolutely against the further stockpiling of nuclear weapons in Europe, and for completely freeing the continent of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. They stand for complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles -- both ballistic and cruise missiles -- in the European zone as the first step in this direction.

Implementation of such a measure requires that the United States make a commitment not to supply its strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries while Britain and France make a pledge not to increase their corresponding nuclear armaments. Once American medium-range missiles are completely eliminated in Europe, there will be no need for the further presence of Soviet operational-tactical missiles of enhanced range in the countries where they were installed.

Participants in the meeting believe that the establishment of nuclear-free zones in different regions of the continent would be a good step on the way to delivering Europe from nuclear weapons. They support the proposals for establishing such zones in Scandinavia and the Balkans as well as proposals for creating a nuclear-free corridor along the line dividing the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries in central Europe.

The states represented at the meeting want the European Continent to be fully cleared of chemical weapons. In this connection they support the proposals of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania for establishing zones free of chemical weapons accordingly in central Europe and the Balkans.

The ministers consider it necessary to invigorate the Vienna talks on mutual armed forces and arms cuts in central Europe to most speedily reach mutually acceptable agreements. The proposals presented on 20 February 1986 by the allied socialist states -- direct participants in the talks -- contribute to drawing the sides' stands closer. Hope was expressed that these proposals will meet with a positive response.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states call for steadily carrying on the all-European process, and for strengthening security and developing cooperation in Europe.

The ministers have discussed the state of affairs at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and consider it necessary to accelerate its work in order to complete the first stage by the adoption of a substantial final document, that would be tabled at the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The ministers expect the forthcoming meeting in Berne of experts of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe dealing with questions of contacts between people, institutions, and organizations to be held in a constructive atmosphere. It was pointed out that the socialist states will further consistently work for fully ensuring, given the respect for the sovereignty of states, human rights in all fields, especially, the right to life in conditions of peace and freedom.

An exchange of views and information has been held on the course of preparations for the scheduled meeting of representatives of states -- participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which is to open in Vienna this autumn. That meeting is designed to make a substantial contribution to improving the political climate and reviving detente in Europe and in the world, in coordinating major new steps for lowering the level of military confrontation on the European Continent, and broadening cooperation between European states. The need for developing economic and scientific-technological cooperation and building up confidence in economic relations was stressed.

The opening of the Vienna meeting at the foreign ministers level would give it the necessary political impetus.

The ministers have examined in detail questions pertaining to strengthening peace and security and the development of cooperation on the European Continent, and have resolutely declared that the inviolability of borders, respect for territorial-political realities, which were shaped as a result of World War II, and post-war developments are the necessary prerequisites for preserving peace and security in Europe. They have condemned the dangerous activity of the revanchist forces, above all in the FRG, and stressed that revanchism and support for it anywhere poison the political atmosphere and are detrimental to mutual understanding among the European nations, thus threatening the outbreak of a military conflict.

3. The ministers have stressed the importance of accelerating work at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons for a practical response to the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth, and achieving weighty results in the interests of all peoples. They support the Soviet Union's constructive stand at the talks directed at this.

The meeting reaffirmed the need to prevent the spread of the arms race into outer space and to limit the use of outer space solely for peaceful aims for the benefit of all mankind. Preserving a peaceful outer space is the necessary prerequisite for carrying out far-reaching cuts and eliminating nuclear weapons.

Note was taken of the serious responsibility assumed by the initiators of the program for the emplacement of weapons in space and those who join in carrying it out, and also of the danger which the implementation of projects, similar to the so-called "European Defense Initiative," advanced in some Western European countries, would entail.

Noting the urgent need to end nuclear testing as an important measure to improve the international atmosphere and a major step along the road toward eliminating nuclear weapons, the Warsaw Treaty member-states call on the United States to terminate any nuclear explosions the way the Soviet Union did. The participants in the meeting welcome the statement of the USSR in which it said it would not conduct nuclear explosions after its unilateral moratorium expired on 31 March 1986 -- until the United States carries out its first nuclear explosion.

Everything should be done to reach agreement on the termination of all nuclear explosions. They came out in favor of an undelayed beginning of bilateral Soviet-American, or the resumption of tripartite -- involving Britain -- talks, on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and in favor of holding multilateral talks on that problem within the framework of the Geneva conference on disarmament. Agreement was expressed with the proposal of the nonaligned countries on holding consultations with a view to making the 1962 Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water apply also to underground tests, which are not covered by the treaty.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states believe the task of the complete elimination of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture as early as in this century to be quite feasible. Talks on the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of the existing stockpiles of such weapons should be intensified. They stand for reaching accords on a multilateral basis on the non-transfer of chemical weapons to anyone whomsoever and on their non-emplacement on the territory of other states. The states represented at the meeting, themselves adhering to this, call on the NATO countries to display similar restraint.

They came out in favor of a ban on the creation of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles which, in terms of their casualty-producing capabilities, are approximate to means of mass destruction.

The states represented at the meeting confirm their stance in favor of not increasing and in favor of reducing the military expenditures of states, and above all those possessing a major military potential.

They proceed from the need for efficacious, effective monitoring [kontrol] in all spheres of the limitation and reduction of arms and disarmament -- the kind of monitoring which must accord with the volume and nature of pledges made by the sides.

The meeting's participants advocate that each arms limitation and disarmament measure should not only bring greater security but must also make it possible to allocate more money for the improvement of people's conditions of life, and for the elimination of their military organizations. The Warsaw Pact member-states as before, are prepared to enter into negotiations with the NATO member-states to reach an appropriate agreement, starting with the question of the mutual reduction of military activity.

They renew their proposal that a treaty be concluded on mutual non-use of military force and maintaining relations of peace, that would be open also to all European and other countries concerned.

4. The ministers have stressed the need for resolutely putting an end to the imperialist position of strength policy and interference in the internal affairs of other states, with its manifestations in acts of aggression, state terrorism, hostile campaigns to discredit the policy of other states, and discriminatory measures in economic relations.

The socialist countries represented at the meeting reaffirm their determination to work for strict observance of the right of all people to independently decide their destiny. They are ready to contribute actively to settling conflict situations and disputes between states peacefully and through negotiations.

The participants in the meeting have noted the important role of the Nonaligned Movement as an influential force in the international arena, its contribution to preserving and strengthening universal peace, to the anti-imperialist struggle for abolishing racism, neocolonialism and economic discrimination, and to developing equitable international political and economic cooperation.

An essential task is to establish a new international economic order, to eliminate economic backwardness, and to justly settle the foreign debt problem. Businesslike talks within the UN framework with the participation of all states for a global settlement of the most important international economic problems would contribute to that.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states call for convening a world forum to discuss the complex economic and security problems, the establishment of a new international economic order, the development of trade and scientific-technological cooperation, and the removal of all that hampers world economic ties.

5. The ministers have stressed that in the complex international situation special significance is assumed by the strengthening unity and cohesion of the Warsaw Treaty member-states. The states represented at the meeting reaffirm the importance of their defense alliance for ensuring their security and peaceful development, and for strengthening European and universal peace. They will further closely cooperate in international affairs, in outlining and implementing an agreed policy of peace, security, and international cooperation.

The significance of developing mutual economic relations, strengthening and perfecting cooperation within the CMEA framework, speedily implementing the comprehensive program for progress in science and technology, successfully implementing the socio-economic development plans, strengthening the international positions of the socialist states and achieving the aims of their peaceable foreign policy were noted.

The states represented at the meeting favor constructive cooperation with the governments, parties, public organizations, and movements concerned with the destinies of peace on earth, with all peoples with the aims of creating a comprehensive international security system, affirming the principle of peaceful coexistence in inter-state relations. They stress that at present ensuring the security of states is above all a political issue, which is to be resolved only through political means.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states will do everything in their power so that 1986, which the United Nations Organization has declared an international year of peace, will be marked with real progress towards an improvement in European and world affairs.

The meeting of the foreign ministers committee proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation. It was agreed that the next meeting will be held in Bucharest.

CEMA MACHINE BUILDING SESSION IN BUDAPEST NOTED

LD210037 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] A routine session of the CEMA committee on cooperation in machine building has taken place in Budapest. Taking part in its work were representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, Czechoslovakia, and also Yugoslavia. Questions on implementing the comprehensive program of scientific and technological progress of CEMA countries up to the year 2000, including questions on speeding up scientific and technological progress in machine building industries and significantly raising the quality of machines and equipment, were considered. Representatives of the countries in the committee were received by Lazar, member of the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers.

UN SECRETARY GENERAL PRAISES SOVIET UN ACTIVITY

LD210808 Moscow TASS in English 0745 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] New York March 21 TASS -- U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar spoke highly of the U.S.S.R.'s activity at the United Nations Organization aimed at promoting peace, international security, mutual understanding and cooperation among nations. Receiving the credentials from Yuriy Dubinin, permanent representative of the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations and representative of the U.S.S.R. in the Security Council, he stressed the importance of the Soviet peace initiatives for curbing the arms race, removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe and ensuring universal security through disarmament. The U.N. secretary general pointed out that at the present-day complex international situation the principal task of the United Nations is to intensify efforts to maintain world peace and security and to work for peace all over the world.

ARBATOV ON NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL BREAKTHROUGH

AU171611 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 11 Mar 86 p 4

[Academician Georgiy Arbatov article: "The Decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress: Strategic Course Toward Universal Security"]

[Text] In the international arena a breakthrough is needed for the better. The nations of the world expect it and are insistently demanding it. The practical approach toward this great goal was yet again confirmed in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee delivered by Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev. This report defines the basic aims and directions of the party's foreign policy strategy. The humanism of the communist ideology and its moral values also determine our ideal for building international relations at this stage; it is an ideal for a world free of weapons and force, a world in which each people freely chooses its own path of development. And as was noted in the Political Report, "in the future the main line of the party's activity in the world arena remains the struggle against the nuclear threat, against the arms race, and for the preservation and strengthening of general peace." There is no alternative to this policy, and we are not looking for one.

On 3 October 1985 in Paris Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in remarking that human thought possess the sad capacity of lagging behind fast-changing reality, noted that we in the Soviet Union are beginning to rethink many things and to bring them into full conformity with the new realities, including in the military and political fields. In other words, here we are speaking of the development of a new concept for international security, of a new approach toward such security. In the Political Report a detailed analysis is made of everything which arises from the setting of such a task. In the development of the new conception examination is not simply confined to concrete proposals; our approach to these important international problems is also set out in a larger conceptual framework.

First, in our epoch reliable security must not and cannot be provided solely by military-technical means. Security is a political problem and can be solved only by political means. This became particularly evident when new weaponry appeared, which turned military might into a nuclear boomerang. "Security cannot be built forever on the fear of retribution, that is, on the doctrines of "deterrence" or "threats." Second, in developing the new conception concerning security, we proceed from the standpoint that you cannot have security at the expense of another country or to the detriment of another country. Now we can mutually have either security or absolute risk. If we speak of the relations with the United States, the security is mutual, while if we speak in a broader international framework, then universal security and security for all is a term which was coined in the report of the "Palme Commission."

We proceed from the standpoint that such an approach meets mutual interests. Although the United States, as was said in the Political Report, even today remains the engine of militarism, nonetheless such an approach corresponds not only to our interests, but also to those of America. Apart from this, the world does not consist solely of the United States. It is much wider, and universal security meets the interests of the whole of mankind, of all countries and peoples. And there is a further element in our approach. It consists in the fact that the world finds itself in a process of impetuous experimentation and of headlong changes, and no one is in a position to preserve an eternal status quo in the world. This is a reality which we have to take into account -- dozens of states exist in the world, each of which has its own legal rights and interests, but in addition to this all must -- with all the sharp contradictions -- master the science and art of peaceful coexistence, the science and art of behaving in the international arena in a restrained, attentive, and civilized manner, that is, in conditions of correct international dealings and cooperation.

USSR DEPUTY MINISTER ILICHEV ON FOREIGN POLICY

AU272208 Sofia NARODNA MLADEZH in Bulgarian 25 Feb 86 p 33

[Interview with Leonid Ilichev, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, with unnamed NARODNA MLADEZH correspondent; date and place not given]

[Text] "I am glad to take advantage of this opportunity which enables me to address the younger generation in fraternal Bulgaria from the pages of your newspaper. You People show a constant interest in the life of people in our country, in its Communist Party, and in the Soviet state. It is with satisfaction that I note the interested approach of Bulgarian youths to international problems, and I consider this a confirmation of the active stand of those who are the militant reserves of the fighters of communism, for a world without wars, for clear skies over our planet."

This is the opening statement with which Leonid Fedorovich Ilichev, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, delegate to the 27th CPSU Congress, began his interview with our correspondent in the USSR.

[NARODNA MLADEZH] Can you describe the characteristic features of the new edition of the CPSU draft program regarding USSR foreign policy at this stage?

[Ilichev] The CPSU Program which is now still valid was adopted at the 22d CPSU Congress in 1961, as you know. The quarter of a century which has elapsed since that time had confirmed the correctness of this program's fundamental, political postulates, as well as our party's and the Soviet state's general line on the international scene. Naturally the basic postulates laid down in the aforementioned program are still valid and are preserved in the new draft program which was submitted to the CPSU congress. This is why the first characteristic feature of this program can be described as a continuation of the existing CPSU program. However, time goes on. Within the last 25 years, and I presume that the majority of your readers are of the same age, or approximately 25 years old, the colonial empires collapsed and dozens of new states were established on their ruins. An approximate military-strategic balance was achieved between the USSR and the United States. The world has changed and it is fully understandable that the time has come to analyze the experience accumulated and the new phenomena of international life on a scientific basis in order to be able to determine the chief trends and goals of our policy under the present historical conditions in a more precise and specific manner. The analysis of the new, contemporary world and of its development from a Marxist-Leninist point of view; the critical evaluation of certain former postulates, which are outdated; and the innovative approach to the crucial problems; and to the strategy and tactics of our country on the world scene can be defined as the second characteristic trait in the foreign policy of the CPSU and of the Soviet state.

The draft program is characterized by another trait as well. The Central Committee Commission which worked on the text of the new draft program based itself on the Leninist instructions stating that the CPSU Program must express our basic views, based on principles, and our long-term political goals, that this program must be an unmistakable and accurate presentation of the goals for which the CPSU is struggling and which it will struggle for within the foreseeable future. This is precisely why the CPSU draft program is based on a strictly realistic approach without going into unnecessary details that are likely to tie our hands and prevent creative innovative actions. In other words, stress is laid on the determination of the strategic trends in the party's work and on its objective evaluation of its own opportunities and future prospects. It is particularly important to stress that in saying all this, we must add that the foreign policy portion of the draft program (and this is quite understandable) is aimed at a peaceful manner of settling the historical controversy between the two opposed social systems into which the contemporary world is divided. We are convinced that socialism is capable of and obliged to prove its advantages by the strength of the creative example and not by the force of weapons.

[NARODNA MLADJEZH] The new CPSU draft program stresses the enhanced role of the developing countries in the worldwide political and economic sphere as a characteristic feature of our present-day epoch. How can you describe the importance of the developing countries in the joint struggle for peace and international security?

[Ilichev] The forceful mass presence of the young states on the world scene is a qualitative leap in the system of international relations, which made this system a truly worldwide system for the first time in history. The world's political structure changed as a result of this. The participation of all peoples from the East in the settlement of the fate of all mankind, which was predicted by Vladimir Ilich Lenin, became true. If we consider the world of the developing countries and the trends that are prevailing in this world, in their entirety, the answer to your question can be quite definite: The newly liberated countries, as some of the most important political forces of the world, are undeniably playing a positive role in the joint struggle for peace and for international security. In other words, in the deployment of world forces, these countries belong to the antiwar and anti-imperialist forces.

Our party, the CPSU, has always devoted great attention to the consolidation of the relations between the Soviet Union and the newly liberated countries. The new CPSU draft program devotes an entire section to this question, in which the basic trends of the further development of these relations are mapped out.

The alliance of the forces of social progress and of national liberation is a guarantee for a better future for mankind. It is on this basis that the Soviet Union will further develop its relations with the newly liberated countries.

Going back to the thesis that the solution of numerous international problems depends on the newly liberated countries as well, I would like to say that this is not only due to their number, according to which they represent more than two-thirds of the states existing in the world today. It is because in their zone, dangerous conflicts are erupting today, conflicts whose influence reaches far beyond their borders, exacerbating the already tense international situation. Without the participation of the newly liberated countries the chief problem of our contemporary epoch -- the problem of war and peace -- cannot be solved. International security demands today that peace should be ensured not only in Europe, but also in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, as well as on the oceans. To consolidate international security -- this is the cause of every country and every nation, the cause of the broad international coalition of peace-loving forces on our planet.

REACTION CONTINUES TO CONTRA AID CAMPAIGN, VOTE

Reagan Broadcast Hit

PM201155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Gan article: "Truth Will Out"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Mar -- President Reagan today addressed the country on national television and tried to "substantiate" Washington's support for the anti-Nicaraguan bandits -- the "contras" -- and whitewash its interference in the affairs of a sovereign state.

The President said nothing new in his speech, which was made up of slander and anti-Soviet insinuations. Manipulating a blatant lie, he made unpardonable attacks on the Soviet Union and Cuba, which allegedly have one thought alone -- "a communist takeover of Central America." Presidential advisers had not been idle and had furnished Reagan with a false picture intended to "graphically illustrate" the scale of the "Red threat" in the region. Under this farfetched thesis the President was able to bring up "arguments" amounting to the suggestion that little Nicaragua "is a threat to U.S. security." As if ignorant of the fact that his country maintains diplomatic relations with the Managua government, Reagan called the Sandinists a "criminal regime" guilty of all the mortal sins. He extolled in every way possible the CIA-protected terrorist groups, even going as far as to say that Americans are supposedly "indebted to them" for protecting "U.S. security."

Insisting on a direct military solution to the conflict, the President groundlessly claimed that his administration has "striven and is striving for peace through negotiations." It is well known, however, that responsibility for the breakdown of negotiations rests with Washington, which would have liked to turn them into a means of diktat and of imposing its will on the Nicaraguan Government.

At the same time, Reagan, willingly or unwillingly, disclosed the true state of affairs with respect to the anti-Nicaraguan hysteria. From his words it is evident that the Pentagon considers Central America a most important region in strategic respects both for the United States and for all its allies. It is clear that countries pursuing independent policies in this region stick in American strategists' craw.

Kindling chauvinism and anti-Sovietism, Reagan has virtually blackmailed congressmen who, despite pressure from the administration, show no desire to allocate \$100 million in aid for the "contras." In an attempt to deprive the legislators of "freedom to maneuver," the President has stated the issue thus: Either you vote for military supplies for terrorists, or you throw them to "the mercy of communist enemies."

A lie, as is well known, will not stand up for long. The President's speech aroused indignation among the American public and many members of Congress. Answering the President on behalf of the Democrats, Senator J. Sasser from the state of Tennessee said that the majority of Americans do not approve of the administration's aggressive, confrontational policy. On the one hand, he said, the White House is demanding that the people "tighten their belts" to get rid of the budget deficit while, on the other, it is trying to get an allocation of \$100 million for undeclared war against Nicaragua. Noting the brutalities committed by the "contras" with American assistance the senator pointed out that almost every government in the region supports the "Con-tadora process." The Sandinists have indicated their willingness to hold negotiations; but the President insists on "expanding the war against Nicaragua," urging a blind rush into the quagmire of military operations. We have already been in that quagmire, Sasser noted.

During the President's speech, approximately 600 representatives of the American public gathered around the White House fence, protesting U.S. interventionism in Central America. "United States and CIA -- Out of Nicaragua!", "Hands Off the People of Nicaragua!", "Feed the Starving, Not the 'Contras'!" -- the banners read.

"We support the Nicaraguans' right to independent development and their desire to choose their own future for themselves," a representative of the "Information Committee in Support of Nicaragua," which organized the demonstration, told our correspondent. "We are opposed to aid for the 'contras' and to any compromises by Congress in this issue. Our President has not told the truth, in an attempt to blacken the great achievements of the Sandinist government in satisfying the needs of its country's people. This is provocative rhetoric which has nothing in common with actual reality."

...In his speech Reagan claimed that history will call the United States to account if the "contras" do not receive American military aid. History will indeed call the United States to account if the blood of a freedom-loving people of a freedom-loving country flows once again in the name of the United States and by the use of its weapons.

Congress Rejects Aid

LD202040 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 20 TASS -- Today, despite the gross pressure on the part of the White House, the U.S. House of Representatives turned down the administration's request for the allocation of 100 million dollars in aid to the Nicaraguan "contras".

'Sharp Discontent' Noted

LD210803 Moscow TASS in English 0739 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 21 TASS -- President Reagan has expressed sharp discontent with the refusal of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress to approve the administration's request for the release of 100 million dollars in aid to survivors of Somoza followers. The White House has published a statement by the head of the administration, in which the latter declares his firm determination to go ahead with getting Congress to pass his bill on real and effective aid to gangs of counter-revolutionaries and, among other things, to intensify a campaign of pressure on Congress. Reagan's intensive lobbying campaign is connected with the upcoming vote on the administration's request in the Senate and the votes on the "alternative variants" of aid to the Nicaraguan "contras" in the House of Representatives are scheduled for mid April, Reagan advised the enemies of the Nicaraguan people not to lose hope.

No-Confidence Vote Given

LD210955 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy Reports:

Washington faced a no-confidence vote from U.S. lawmakers for its policy of institutionalized terrorism against sovereign Nicaragua.

On Thursday, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress voted 210 to reject the Reagan administration's request for releasing 100 million dollars in aid to gangs of the survivors of Somoza followers who make attempts with the assistance of the Central Intelligence agency to overthrow the lawful Government of Nicaragua. Seventy million dollars out of this sum were to be allotted to shipments of modern weapons and 30 million -- for equipment, clothing and food for the enemies of the Nicaraguan people.

The results of the vote in the House of Representatives became, as UPI news agency put it, a major foreign policy defeat for President Reagan who personally led a campaign to condition Congress and the public, a campaign which is unprecedented in terms of its intensity and shrillness. Reagan devoted his recent television appearance and also several radio addresses to the issue of boosting aid to the "contras". The President and other senior officials of the administration were engaged in "arms twisting" making numerous telephone calls and summoning congressmen to the White House. Besides, the White House was not averse to employing openly McCarthyist tactics, accusing the opponents of aid to the "contras", of lack of patriotism and all but support of communism. Congressman Ronald Dellums said that attempts were made to label him as "red", he was intimidated and hounded.

However, the CBS television network states that despite the intensive lobbying campaign by the White House and its allies in extreme right-wing organisations, the administration's efforts failed to produce a result. This was primarily due to the fact that many lawmakers and Willy-nilly to consider the sentiments of their electors, the majority of whom, as public opinion polls showed, oppose extension of U.S. armed interference in Central America. These sentiments were reflected during stormy two-day debates ahead of the vote. Speaker of the House of Representatives Thomas O'Neill said that the policy of boosting arms shipments to the "contras" pushed the country onto a wrong road, the road of escalating the conflict what could ultimately lead to direct involvement of U.S. troops as was the case in Vietnam.

O'Neill stressed that he was deeply worried over the tactic employed by the administration towards all opponents of this course. He likened the campaign to the times of McCarthyism when those who did not wish their country to be involved in armed ventures abroad were charged with disloyalty to the government.

At the same time, AP news agency writes, the administration's defeat in the House of Representatives still does not by any means signal that the President's bid to secure extra aid for the "contras" has been a setback. The vote is ahead on the Administration's request in the Senate where the Republican Party holds a majority. Besides, a vote on a whole number of "alternative variants" of support of the terrorist anti-Nicaraguan gangs is scheduled in the House of Representatives in mid-April.

LOMEYKO'S 20 MARCH PRESS BRIEFING REPORTED

LD201620 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- Soviet and foreign correspondents have been told at a briefing of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR here today that the participants in a regular meeting of the committee of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty member countries in Warsaw on March 19-20 fully supported the complex of major foreign policy actions of the USSR, outlined by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement on January 15, 1986, and urged the NATO countries, primarily the USA, Britain and France, to show full responsibility in approaching the proposal on nuclear disarmament.

Addressing the journalists, Vladimir Lomeyko, chief of the Press Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, said that the foreign ministers had expressed the hope that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit would concentrate on questions involved in reaching concrete agreement on cuts in nuclear armaments. The United States, naturally, should undertake not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries and Britain and France not to build up their appropriate nuclear armaments.

The participants in the meeting especially emphasized that the common interests of the European countries call for rejecting any programs and ideas for spreading the arms race to outer space. They pointed to the dangerous nature of plans for the so-called European Defense Initiative and other projects threatening to accelerate the arms race in the European Continent. Stress was made at the Warsaw meeting, the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said, on the urgency of the issue of stopping nuclear testing as a top-priority practical measure that will appreciably improve the atmosphere ahead of the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Attention was also called to the need for effective, including international, verification in all fields of arms limitation, arms reduction and disarmament, verification that should correspond to the scope and nature of the obligations assumed by the sides.

When answering questions from journalists, the head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Press Department, said that the Federal Republic of Germany's involvement in the U.S. "star wars" program shows that the West German military-industrial complex wants a part in the arms race which it intends to extend to outer space. Any form of participation in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, he said, is dangerous for West Germany itself as well as for other European nations and ultimately for the world in general.

Dwelling on the statement of the U.S. Department of Defense with the help of which it tried to justify the violation of the state frontier of the U.S.S.R. by U.S. naval ships with references to the right of peaceful passage through the territorial waters of a country, Lomeyko emphasized that this provocative action had nothing in common with peaceful passage. It was nothing less than a wide-scale espionage operation against the U.S.S.R. which pursued the aim of collecting intelligence data about the Soviet Armed Forces. An official spokesman for the Washington administration told journalists in the Pentagon in this connection that the decision about the violation of the Soviet state frontier by the U.S. naval ships was a political decision taken at a markedly higher level than the commanders of those two ships. In other words, Lomeyko said, Washington's reaction confirms that the case in point was a pre-planned defiant provocation against the Soviet Union.

REPORTAGE ON U.S. ACTIVITIES IN MEDITERRANEAN

Libyan Forces on Alert

LD201605 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 20 TASS -- According to a Pentagon spokesman, the U.S. attack aircraft carrier America sailed through Gibraltar and entered the Mediterranean Sea. Escorted by 10 warships, it is heading for a rendezvous with the U.S. naval armada, now on maneuvers in the southern part of the Mediterranean. According to reports from the region of the exercises, the warplanes based on the aircraft carriers Saratoga and Coral Sea are drilling tactical technique during training flights in daylight and at nighttime. Surveillance planes stuffed with modern electronic gear make flights in proximity to the frontiers of Libya's air space.

Tripoli March 20 TASS -- The Armed Forces of the Libyan Jamahiriya have been put on standby alert.

The Libyan people, the JANA news agency reports, is ready to repel any provocation American military may stage and are determined to defend independence and sovereignty of their country. Demonstrations and rallies in support of the anti-imperialist course of the Libyan leadership have been held in the capital of Libya and other cities. The demonstrators have strongly condemned the provocative maneuvers of the 6th U.S. fleet off the coast of Libya and branded Washington's policy of blackmail and military pressure.

Lomeyko on Exercises

LD201711 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- "The anti-Libyan campaign which has been launched by the United States should not be viewed as some isolated and the only instance," Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated here today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. "The campaign is a link in the chain of U.S. imperialism's actions to destabilize the situation in other parts of the world and in other progressive states, such as Angola, Nicaragua, etc."

In answer to a question as to how the situation around Libya is estimated in the light of the continuing threats and provocations on the part of the USA, the ministry's spokesman pointed out that the U.S. Navy had started large-scale exercises near the Libyan coast, the exercises which are already the fourth ones within a period of about three months. "Today one would like to emphasize once again that the militarist fuss, the U.S. provocative war-games which are directed against the sovereign Arab state cannot be regarded otherwise than the imperial concept of 'neoglobalism' in action. Libya's active anti-imperialist course and its resolute opposition to Washington's attempts at establishing an 'American-style peace' in the Middle East simply 'do not suit' the U.S. Administration. Therefore the USA through methods of crude military-political and economic pressure seeks to undermine the progressive Libyan regime, to intimidate the people of that country and to make it abandon the pursuance of the independent domestic and foreign policy."

The head of the Press Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs went on to say that the Soviet Union, coming out in support of the Libyan people, most firmly condemned the hostile anti-Libyan campaign launched by the USA and Israel, the economic sanctions and the ostentatious military preparations against the sovereign Arab state. "Such kind of actions cannot be viewed otherwise than posing a threat to peace and security not only in the Mediterranean area but outside it as well."

"It is being expected in Soviet leading circles that a sober-minded view of the existing realities will come to prevail in the USA and that it will seriously weigh the dangerous consequences which a continuation of the U.S. policy with regard to the sovereign Libyan state may lead to."

'Armed Provocation' Begins

PM201126 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch under general heading "Terrorism in Action"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Mar -- The Pentagon is embarking on the implementation of an armed provocation on an unprecedented scale against Libya.

Reagan administration spokesmen have announced that U.S. military maneuvers are beginning today in the immediate vicinity of Libya's shores, with the aircraft carriers Coral Sea and Saratoga, escort ships, and deck aviation taking part. They will be joined in a day or two by a third aircraft carrier, the America. According to reports from Pentagon sources, a total of almost 40 U.S. Navy ships will be involved in these games. The Defense Department is transparently hinting at the likelihood that its naval armada will intrude into the Gulf of Sidra, which is under Libyan sovereignty.

Actually, people in Washington not only make no secret but even boast of the brazen decision to exert military pressure on the independent Arab state. CBS-TV cited statements by U.S. Administration officials who frankly declared that it is more than just a question of "simple maneuvers." They noted that while the United States had previously "limited itself basically to threats," now it is "fully prepared to act." CBS pointed out that the participants in the maneuvers "will essentially provoke Libya into a conflict."

By exercising the "right of might," Washington is yet again demonstrating that, as far as it is concerned, international law and the elementary norms of interstate relations are not worth a cent.

Navy Actions Noted

PM201718 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Mar 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS Report: "U.S. Naval Provocation"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Mar -- In connection with the violation by American warships of the USSR state border in the Black Sea and the protest made by the Soviet Union to the American side for this reason, the U.S. Department of the Navy has made a statement in which it tries to justify this hostile action. It claims that the transit of two U.S. Navy ships off Soviet shores to the south of the Crimean Peninsula was neither "defiant" nor "provocative." In this respect the department cites some "right of peaceful passage." What this "peaceful passage" means in Washington's interpretation is discussed in an article published by THE NEW YORK TIMES.

The violation of the USSR state border in the Black Sea off the southern coast of the Crimea by American warships on 13 March this year was carried out within the framework of a regular large-scale U.S. espionage operation against the USSR under orders from the Pentagon, the newspaper reported. One of the aims of this preplanned action, it writes, citing official representatives of the U.S. Defense Department, was to "gather intelligence" about the Soviet Union and its Armed Forces. In this connection numerous listening devices and other electronic apparatus for gathering information on the Armed Forces and arms were installed on board the cruiser Yorktown and the destroyer Caron which penetrated Soviet waters.

Officials have indicated, THE NEW YORK TIMES continues, that the order to carry out this action was issued by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on behalf of Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and that similar "exercises" are planned for the Gulf of Sidra off the Libyan coast.

Pentagon representatives have also stated that the action in the Black Sea and the similar operations planned off Libyan shores also have the aim of "supporting President Reagan's appeal to Congress to approve an increase in military expenditure in fiscal 1987, which begins on 1 October." "When the United States has flexed its muscles in the past, officials have pointed out, such incidents have led to increased support for the President's policy in Congress," the newspaper notes.

Thus, the claimed "right of peaceful passage" for its warships through foreign territorial waters is simply a screen with which the United States tries to conceal pre-planned provocation by the U.S. military against sovereign states. The Pentagon has already officially announced the beginning of new maneuvers by the U.S. Navy in direct proximity of the Libyan coast. The aircraft carriers Saratoga and Coral Sea, at present in the Mediterranean, will participate in the fourth "show of muscle" in under 3 months, as well as the strike aircraft carrier America hurrying to join them, which will enter the waters of the Mediterranean sea in the next 2 days. A representative of the U.S. Defense Department reports that deck aircraft from the aircraft carrier America will be in active operation from the very first day of the maneuvers. With the arrival of the America in the Mediterranean, more than 40 U.S. Navy warships will be concentrated near the Libyan coast.

As the CBS television company has reported, the present maneuvers go beyond the bounds of "ordinary exercises." Judging by its words, Washington is trying to provoke Libya in order to gain a pretext for making a military strike against this country, whose independent, anti-imperialist course, as is well known, has long irritated Washington. "In the past we have only talked, but this time we are quite ready for action," CBS quotes the words of one American official representative.

Agayants Comments

LD201727 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 20 Mar 86

[International affairs journalist Nikolay Agayants commentary]

[Text] The latest U.S. naval maneuvers off the Gulf of Sidra are one more link in the chain of Washington's provocations against the Libyan Jamahiriyyah, says a report from a JANA correspondent in Tripoli. Here is a Mayak commentary: At the microphone is international affairs journalist Nikolay Agayants:

Two U.S. aircraft carriers, the Coral Sea and the Saratoga, have now been plying the waters of the Mediterranean for more than 2 months and the strike aircraft carrier America is heading toward them at full steam from the Atlantic accompanied by 10 destroyers, cruisers, and auxiliary vessels. In all, let me remind you, this armada from the U.S. 6th Fleet now numbers over 40 fighting ships. These are the main participants in the latest stage of the dangerous war games undertaken by the Pentagon off the coast of Libya.

In the words of a correspondent for the CBS television network, these will be more than routine exercises. Their purpose is to provoke the Libyan Armed Forces in order to have a pretext for a strike at Libyan territory. Citing a spokesman for the Washington administration who asked to remain anonymous, AP writes that this time U.S. ships and aircraft may try to violate the waters and airspace in the Gulf of Sidra in order to see what retaliatory measures Libya might take to such a provocation. According to information in the U.S. mass media, the Pentagon has long since earmarked targets and installations at which strikes might be launched by the U.S. Navy and Air Force. The U.S. special propaganda services are now clearly seeking excuses and justifications, if one can call them that, for undertaking armed action against the Jamahiriyyah. The imperialist ideologues' fabrications about a threat to the United States from Tripoli are absurd and groundless. The simple fact is that Washington cannot reconcile itself to the independent line Libya follows on the international scene, with its reluctance to submit to U.S. dictates and its frank opposition to Washington's plans for resolving the Middle East conflict.

True to the spirit of the doctrine of militant neoglobalism, these aggressive actions against Libya by the most powerful state in the capitalist world cannot fail to arouse, and indeed they are, serious alarm and anxiety among the peoples of the Mediterranean region, who are resolutely demanding that Washington stop its dangerous playing with fire.

AYTMATOV 'NOT HINTING AT CIA' IN PALME ARTICLE

PM201355 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 17 Mar 86 p 8

[Interview with Soviet writer Chingiz Aytmatov by Disa Hastad: "Not Hinting at CIA" -- date and place not given]

[Excerpt] "The people who murdered Olof Palme do not need to come from the United States or the CIA -- even though it does seem to be a case of reactionary forces. When I wrote my article in PRAVDA, I was shocked at the murder and at how easy it is to murder someone. If people are murdered on the streets of neutral Sweden too, it is the murder of democracy," Soviet author Chingiz Aytmatov told DAGENS NYHETER. Aytmatov is at present visiting Stockholm and was commenting on the article he wrote in PRAVDA when the news of Palme's murder become known.

The phrase "this terrorist act of violence was not carried out by people from another planet but by forces here on earth that are interested in driving whole regions and countries to the right" was interpreted by Swedish newspapers as a reference to the CIA and the United States. The previous day, the TASS news agency had hinted at the same idea.

Chingiz Aytmatov is now clearly alarmed that his words could be interpreted as such a clear reference and told me how he was given the task of writing the article: "We were sitting there at the congress at 2200 hours; it was Chebirkov who read the message about Palme's death. We all rose. Everyone was shaken. Personally I was shocked. I thought: If these neutral countries, which are like buffer zones between the East and West, are no longer secure places of refuge and terrorism, and murder is instead able to occur on the open street -- where can we feel safe?

"And in this way it was a murder, not only of Palme as a human being and politician, but of democracy."

SHULTZ TOUR AIMS TO PRESSURE GREECE, TURKEY

LD210925 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 21 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz is beginning today a ten-day tour of West European countries. It is not concealed here that the main aim of the tour is an attempt to exert pressure on the governments of the two countries of the NATO's southern flank -- Greece and Turkey to get their consent for preservation of U.S. military bases of their territory. In the course of his trip George Shultz will make brief stop-overs in France and Italy.

COMMENTATOR HITS U.S. WARSHIPS VISIT TO KARACHI

BK201015 Moscow in Hindi to India 1400 GMT 19 Mar 86

[Unattributed Commentary]

[Text] The visit of six warships led by the nuclear aircraft carrier Enterprise of the U.S. 7th Fleet to Karachi port is a matter of serious concern. First of all, the presence of the U.S. warships near India's coast says a lot by itself; and now a special contingent of the U.S. 7th fleet, whose area of operation includes the Pacific and Indian Oceans, is visiting Karachi port. In fact, it is a welcome visit for the U.S. ships to this port which the Pentagon considers a (?forward) post for the support of its fleet activities in the Indian Ocean. In this connection, it is worth recalling that the Pentagon has about 30 bases in the Indian Ocean region; foremost among them the multipurpose military base on Diego Garcia.

American military planners, however, think that this base is far from the Asian mainland, and the visit of the U.S. warships to Karachi port is considered the first step toward using this new port. Not only U.S. warships, but also the Rapid Deployment Force would be able to use this facility. A contingent of this force has been deployed on the ships now visiting Karachi port.

The visits of the U.S. warships to Karachi should be seen in the context of U.S. plans to use Pakistan strategically in the framework of U.S.-Pakistan military cooperation. In 1981, when the U.S. Navy's frigate (Hermes) visited Karachi, negotiations between the United States and Pakistan for \$3.2 billion in U.S. military aid to Pakistan were at a peak.

Today, when many U.S. warships are at anchor in Karachi, talks on \$6.5 billion in new military aid are nearing completion. It could be suggested that the visit of the Enterprise is meant to test whether the Pakistani rulers are ready to consider the wishes of the partner from across the ocean or not.

The visits of the U.S. warships to Pakistani ports are part of the plan to use Pakistan for U.S. strategic objectives. This plan came to light in 1980 when CBS reported it.

The plan revealed the use of Pakistani ports and airports by U.S. warships and planes and the stationing of technical experts first -- and later soldiers -- on Pakistani military bases. Now when Pakistan has allowed the United States to use its military bases in return for weapons, the denial by the U.S. State Department to this effect in 1980 is shown to be baseless.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz spoke before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the time when U.S. warships were present in Karachi. Shultz expressed readiness to provide further military aid to Pakistan. As before, he expects to gain military bases in return.

A special resolution adopted at the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of India condemned U.S. military activities near the Indian coasts because the visit of the U.S. warships to Pakistan poses a direct threat to Indian security.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFGHAN REBELS CRITICIZED

Meese Visit Scored

PM201122 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Message to the Bandits"]

[Text] Washington, 18 Mar -- THE WASHINGTON TIMES reports that President Reagan has instructed Attorney General Edwin Meese to convey a greetings message to the Afghan "freedom-fighters" at the end of March.

Department spokesman P. Korten stated in this connection that Meese will read the President's message at an "Afghan refugee" camp near the Pakistani border with the DRA. It is no secret that in official Washington both terms are used to describe the dushman gangs which carry out gangsterlike armed raids against the Afghan people and Government with the help of U.S. weapons and the CIA.

The attorney general will carry out Reagan's instruction during a trip to a number of countries in the course of which he will visit a dushman camp in Pakistan. The official "cover" for the trip to Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, and Italy by the delegation of representatives from various U.S. departments headed by Meese is to "study the problem of the spread of narcotics in the world." However, it is absolutely obvious that the political "high point" of the trip will be the visit by a U.S. Administration member to an Afghan terrorist camp near the city of Peshawar. As the Justice Department spokesman pointed out, the "trip is being made on President Reagan's personal instructions."

Meese's candidacy for the post of delegation leader was, by all accounts, no accident. Not so long ago he was part of the intelligence section of the U.S. Army Reserve with the rank of lieutenant colonel. Moreover, the current attorney general's bel-ligerent mood was so great that he even -- without blushing, as the saying goes -- promoted himself. Nor, judging by his speeches, has Meese moderated his militarists ardor.

Meese's trip is the latest in a series of provocative trips by ranking Washington officials to camps of the enemies of the Afghan people in order to coordinate the waging of the undeclared war against the sovereign DRA. This war, which is part and parcel of the notorious "neoglobalism strategy" is now being made more and more extensive in scope.

Shultz Assures Support

LD211419 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, 21 Mar (TASS) -- Political observer Askold Biryukov writes: U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has not passed by the opportunity of once again stating the U.S. "resolve" to continue its blood-letting undeclared war against the DRA. Speaking on the occasion of the new year which begins today in Afghanistan, he extolled the "national liberation struggle" of the Afghan dushmans, at whose hands this war is being waged, and assured these bandits and terrorists that the United States "will support the cause of the heroic Afghan resistance until such time as it is no longer necessary..."

In the same statement, the U.S. secretary of state allowed himself "a few words" on Washington's policy in relation to a political settlement. These words, said as if in passing, also confirm only one fact, albeit an already well-known one: The U.S. position on the issue of a political settlement of the situation in Afghanistan remains stiffly negative. It is aimed at continuing to sabotage efforts to settle this issue at the negotiating table and, in essence, at keeping the situation around this country at the boiling point.

The head of the U.S. State Department is still attempting to put the cart before the horse, as the saying goes.

First, he is demanding the withdrawal from Afghanistan of the limited contingent of Soviet troops, sent into that country at the request of its leadership, and only then will he be prepared to discuss a political settlement by diplomatic means. The secretary of state's statement contains, however, not a hint of what was the first cause of the conflict, which has lasted almost 8 years now, and really must be eliminated first of all if a way to a political settlement is to be paved.

This cause is well known: The armed interference from without, mounting from year to year. During these years, imperialism and the counterrevolution it maintains have turned Afghanistan into a bleeding wound. The Soviet Union, which came to the aid of the friendly country, supports its efforts to defend the sovereignty of the DRA.

The U.S. secretary of state should know that the USSR would like to bring the Soviet troops home in the shortest time. The time scale for their stage-by-stage withdrawal has been agreed to with Kabul. In order for it to begin, a political settlement must be reached that will secure a real halt to, and reliably guarantee the nonresumption of, armed interference from outside in the internal affairs of the DRA. There are, however, no hints in Shultz' statement of a halt to this armed interference, whose main organizer and orchestrator is the U.S. Administration.

It is evident that Washington does not wish to remove the thorn in the flesh represented by interference from outside in the DRA's affairs, and in so doing to remove the cause of the conflict. What is more, the administration's actions demonstrate the complete opposite: The United States intends to strive for its continuation and extension with all the negative consequences for the causes of peace and security in the region and throughout the world.

USSR, CANADA DISCUSS FISHING RIGHTS IN LENINGRAD

LD202047 Moscow TASS in English 2019 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- There was useful exchange of opinions on Soviet Canadian fishing contacts and on the problems the solution of which contribute to the development of these contacts at the second round of bilateral consultations on relationships in the industry that took place in Leningrad, TASS has been told by Vyacheslav Zilanov, head of the Foreign Relations and General Supplies Department of the Ministry of Fishing of the USSR.

He said that Soviet fishing in Canada's 200-mile zone met the interests of the sides and that there were good opportunities for expanding it if Soviet ships were given better working conditions. The Soviet fleet does not offer competition to Canadian fishermen. It is fishing within the scientific catch quotas and concentrates on those species which Canadian fishermen practically do not fish. Moreover, the USSR pays Canada substantial license fees, which keep growing from one year to the next.

As for the demands of the Canadian delegation that the Soviet Union should buy fish from Canada, some of them put Soviet importers in a less advantageous position as compared with other buyers. For instance, the Canadian side refuses to count as Soviet purchases fish imports through mixed societies with the participation of Soviet capital, but such restrictions are not applied to other states buying fish from Canada. If these artificial restrictions are not lifted, the Soviet side will have to suspend its fish purchases from Canadian companies, Zilanov said. He noted that the USSR buys fish from Canada though it is not a traditional importer of fish products.

"All this shows that Soviet fishermen do not seek unilateral advantage in developing their contacts with the Canadian partners. That is why we hope for a more constructive approach of the Canadian side to the solution of the problems examined during the latest round of consultations. The Soviet Union stands for broadening and strengthening mutually beneficial and equal contacts with Canada in fishing both on a bilateral and on a multilateral basis," Zilanov said. It was noted at the consultations that the two sides had good experience of successful cooperation in that field, in particular, in exercising international control over fishing.

DEMICHEV CITED ON FESTIVAL ACCORD WITH INDIA

PM201444 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] Delhi, 19 Mar -- A Soviet-Indian intergovernmental agreement on holding a USSR festival in India and an Indian festival in the USSR in 1987-1988 was signed here 18 March. The large-scale comprehensive festivals which will be held on a reciprocal basis will be devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 40th anniversary of India's independence. These reviews of the best aspects and achievements in the basic spheres of life and cooperation in the two countries will last for 1 year after their opening. Festival events will take place in the capitals of union republics, the administrative centers of Indian states and federal territories, other major cities, and various regions of the USSR and India. The program of events will cover the spheres of culture, art, science, education, cinematography, television and radio, press, sports, and public, youth, and women's organizations.

The agreement was signed by P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of culture, and P.V. Narasimha Rao, Indian minister of human resources.

Speaking at the ceremony, both sides emphasized that they intend to organize the festival program to the highest standard and in line with the best traditions and profoundly meaningful relations between the two countries. Both sides will apply all their energy to ensure that the festival becomes a memorable landmark in the history of Indian-Soviet friendship and cooperation.

People in the USSR, the leader of the Soviet delegation stressed, react with particular gratification to the fact that great India will be the first state to be represented at such a large-scale festival. He expressed confidence that the festivals will help to deepen mutual understanding and to strengthen the friendship of the Soviet and Indian peoples, and will open new avenues of multifaceted cooperation between the two countries.

In the evening P.V. Narasimha Rao hosted a dinner in honor of P.N. Demichev. [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2148 GMT on 20 March adds: "Comrade Demichev was also received by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. During their conversation, which was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, they discussed bilateral relations and ways of further developing multifaceted Soviet-Indian cooperation."]

Demichev Departs

LD210616 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 21 Mar 86

[Text] New Delhi March 21 TASS -- The CPSU delegation led by Petr Demichev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, has left New Delhi for Moscow today. The delegation attended the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of India, which was held in the city of Patna, Bihar State, on March 12-17. In the course of the government visit to New Delhi an intergovernmental agreement was signed on the holding of a USSR festival in India and a festival of India in the USSR in 1987-1988.

In the International Delhi Airport the delegation was seen off by P.V. Narasimha Rao, India's minister of manpower resources and home affairs, and other officials.

LD202113 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 20 Mar 86

SRV FOREIGN MINISTRY REJECTS KHMER COMMUNIQUE

[Text] Hanoi March 19 TASS -- A spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) today came forward with a statement in connection with the provocative communique issued in Beijing on March 17 by the leaders of the three Khmer reactionary groupings. The communique, addressed to the Government of Vietnam, constitutes in its essence an attempt at gross interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Kampuchea. The counter-revolutionary leaders, among them the Polpotian criminals, driven out of the country, want behind the back of the Kampuchean people to impose their power upon them under the cover of the so-called "quadri-partite coalition government". That proposal, the spokesman's statement says, is neither more nor less than a Beijing-orchestrated spectacle aimed at calumniating Vietnam or at drawing it into the dishonest game, at interfering with the growing tendency towards a dialogue in South-East Asia, at supporting the Polpotian butchers and at saving the so-called "tripartite coalition government" of Khmer reactionaries from breaking up. The SRV's Ministry of Foreign Affairs is stating again that Vietnam recognizes only the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK) as the sole legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people. The internal problems of Kampuchea should be solved by the Kampuchean people themselves. The fate of the Polpotians and Khmer reactionaries, who perpetrated crimes against the Kampuchean people, will likewise be decided by the Kampuchean people themselves. Vietnam fully supports the PRK's just stand on a political settlement in Kampuchea, the statement emphasises.

OW210451 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 18 Mar 86

[Text] The Philippines Government is continuing its investigation into the siphoning of considerable funds from the state treasury during the rule of the former administration. It has become known that the former Philippines president generously provided money to the head of the White House and his closest aides, particularly Secretary of Defense Weinberger and CIA Director Casey. Mass demonstrations in support of the country's new President Aquino are being held in Manila and other Philippines cities. A mass protest campaign began today against the arbitrary rule of U.S. authorities in U.S. military bases. More than 30,000 Filipino employees from seven U.S. military establishments in the Philippines are taking part in demonstrations, picket lines, and strikes. They include such Pentagon bases as Subic Bay and Clark Field. Trade union leaders have embarked on this action in response to the refusal of U.S. commanders to adopt the conditions of a collective labor agreement proposed by the Filipino side that envisages improvements in labor and living conditions and increases in social benefits for Filipino workers. In connection with this, the local press has been noting the growing class consciousness of the Filipino working people.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON SHEVARDNAZE VISIT TO POLAND

Meets Soviet Activists

PM201438 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 March 1986 First Edition carries on page 4, under the general heading "Friendly Meetings in Warsaw," four TASS dispatches datelined Warsaw 4 March totalling 700 words and covering the activities of USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze in Warsaw.

In addition to reports on the 18 March meeting and exchange of speeches with W. Jaruzelski, wreath-laying ceremonies at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the monument to those who fell in the service of People's Poland, and a meeting at the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society, PRAVDA carries the following passages:

"E.A. Shevardnadze toured the sights of the capital. In the evening [of 18 March] he attended a show at Warsaw's Teatr Wielki.

"Warsaw, 19 Mar -- A conference of the aktiv of party organizations of Soviet foreign institutions in Poland devoted to the results of the 27th CPSU Congress and the tasks of Communists working in Poland in implementing its decisions was held here 18 March. A report was delivered by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, who is on an official friendly visit to Poland. Having spoken in detail about the results of the Soviet Communist forum, he emphasized its great international significance and dwelt on the tasks set by the congress in strengthening fraternal ties and comprehensive fruitful cooperation between socialist states. Soviet specialists working in fraternal Poland can and must make their contribution to this process, the speaker noted."

Warsaw TV Interview

LD202117 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1900 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Interview with Foreign Affairs Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by correspondent Jerzy Wajszczuk on 20 March in Warsaw; questions and answers in Russian with superimposed Polish translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Wajszczuk] I would like to begin with a somewhat informal question. Is this your first visit to Warsaw and Poland?

[Shevardnadze] I am sorry to say so, but unfortunately that is the truth. However, I must say that like every Soviet citizen I know a great deal about Poland, about the Polish nation, its glorious history, and its present. I read a lot about Poland and like everybody else I am interested in the life of the fraternal Polish nation, and in the conditions in which it builds new social relations.

I also like Polish music and the Polish arts as a whole -- film, theater. I had the opportunity to become better acquainted with Polish art. I saw a Polish ballet in the Great Theater, and noted its excellent choreography and very high artistic standard. But I have not had direct contact with Poland until now. Now for the first time I have seen Warsaw and have had my first meeting with inhabitants of Warsaw and with Poland.

I know, I know, now you are going to ask me about my impressions. [laugh]

[Wajszczuk] Oh no, now I would like to turn to more formal questions. For almost a year the Soviet foreign policy machine has been going at full power. Could you define the main directions of Soviet foreign policy today?

[Shevardnadze] It is difficult to give a short answer to such question, the more so as the 27th congress of our party has just ended. The 27th CPSU Congress adopted our program, the program of peace and the concept of security in the contemporary world, taking into consideration all factors -- be they military or political. It also includes the issues of economic security with all the aspects of this problem. The congress has acknowledged peace as the highest value and peaceful coexistence as the main principle in international relations. The basis of such a line is the stance taken by Vladimir Lenin. This was developed at the April plenum of the CPSU Central Committee in 1985. As I have already said it has also been proclaimed at the 27th congress, and so with these principles and concepts as foundations we now move on to practice.

[Wajszczuk] Of particular importance to the contemporary world are Soviet-American relations. What can you say about the dialectics and specific character of these relations in current conditions?

[Shevardnadze] First of all, I would like to say that Comrade Gorbachev stressed that we do not look at the contemporary world exclusively through Soviet-American relations. Every state, every nation has its own place under the sun and our stance takes into consideration the policy of each state and takes into consideration the differing characteristics of such states -- regions and continents. Soviet-American relations do, however, define to a significant degree and in some spheres decisively, the general climate of international relations. Unfortunately, recent years -- since the beginning of the eighties -- have not produced anything good for us. The U.S. Administration was to blame for the increasingly aggravated situation. And as everyone knows the Geneva meeting took place and it brought about specific results. But I would not say that a radical improvement of the international atmosphere has occurred. However, certain results were achieved. The concept of a Geneva spirit was formed, and this has some significance.

[Wajszczuk] How do current Soviet-American relations appear?

[Shevardnadze] In Geneva Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan agreed to a follow-up meeting, to a further stage of talks. We are taking preparations for this meeting very seriously, and all our notions and our concepts of this meeting were presented by Mikhail Gorbachev in his declaration of 15 January 1986. It contains our proposals for the liquidation of nuclear arms, for the solution of this problem in stages to the end of the current century. It also contains our proposals for the liquidation of all types of weapons of mass destruction. We also proposed, as we see it, a universal system of control and other imperative measures for the fulfillment of this programme.

[Wajszczuk] And one more question about international relations. Of particular importance to Europe is European security. What do you think about this?

[Shevardnadze] We all agree with this and I will also say that this is an important element, an important factor of world security in general -- precisely the case of Europe, of European security. The West also agrees with this verbally but when it comes to concrete actions, it turns out that our partners in the West are still not ready.

Here I have concrete examples in mind. Recently we proposed the abolition of Soviet medium-range missiles -- the so called SS-20's -- and also the abolition of U.S. missiles deployed in Europe, such as Pershing, cruise, and also tactical missiles.

When we raise the subject during direct negotiations, for example during talks in Geneva, it appears that our interlocutors are not prepared for that. As a matter of fact, to put it bluntly, they do not want to part with U.S. missiles.

[Wojszczuk] You took part in the gala session of the United Nations. How do you see the tasks of this organization in today's world?

[Shevardnadze] I think that we all, all states -- but first and foremost the socialist states, progressive states, and progressive mankind -- everybody should unite in order to consolidate the authority and the influence of the United Nations. This is a good organization, with good principles and with excellent humanitarian goals, and I think that we should all care about the strengthening of the authority and prestige of the organization.

[Wojszczuk] And a final question. Here I would like to return to Polish matters. It is of the utmost importance for the Polish nation -- the fraternal and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Poland, between Poland and the Soviet Union. How do you, as minister of foreign affairs see these relations?

[Shevardnadze] In one of my speeches during official and formal meetings I called our relationship the relationship of hearts. These are not words and rhetoric to me, this is my deepest conviction; our relationship is very cordial indeed.

Our relations, our cooperation, and our friendship are, in my view, the best guarantee of sovereignty, independence, and freedom for our nations. This is the best guarantee of development for our nations and of implementation of all our plans, the plans adopted by the 27th congress of our party and those plans which will be adopted at the 10th PZPR Congress. I know how seriously and thoroughly Polish comrades and the Polish nation are preparing themselves for the 10th congress.

[Wojszczuk] In the name of Polish viewers I would like to thank you from the bottom of my heart for this meeting.

[Shevardnadze] But I have not said everything yet. I would like to convey warm greetings to the fraternal Polish nation and to sincerely thank the residents of Warsaw for their friendship, brotherhood, and warmth which we felt during our stay here. I particularly would like to thank my colleague Comrade Marian Orzechowski who invited me here and with whom I held very interesting talks. I also thank Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski who devoted a great deal of his attention to us -- and I have magnificent impressions from the meetings with him. We talked about the plans of the Central Committee, about the great organizational and political work which is currently being conducted by your party. This really is a cause for pride. I thank you, therefore, once again and wish many successes and happiness for the whole Polish nation.

[Wojszczuk] Thank you very much.

Shevardnadze Departs

LD201816 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1712 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Warsaw, 20 Mar (TASS) -- E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, who was in Poland on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the PPR Government and who took part in the meeting of the Warsaw Pact foreign ministers committee, left Warsaw for Moscow today.

At the airport he was seen off by M. Orzechowski, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and PPR foreign minister, and other officials.

JARUZELSKI MEETS PACT FOREIGN MINISTERS IN WARSAW

LD201826 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1317 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Warsaw, 20 Mar (TASS) -- Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party and president of the State Council of the People's Republic of Poland, met the foreign affairs ministers of the Warsaw Pact member-states here today. The meeting passed in a cordial and friendly atmosphere.

MONTENEGRO'S STEFANOVIC ARRIVES IN MOSCOW FOR TALKS

PM201448 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Mar 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: On a Friendly Visit]

[Text] M. Stefanovic, chairman of the Socialist Republic of Montenegro (SFRY) Committee for Relations With Foreign Countries, arrived in Moscow on 17 March on a friendly visit at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

At the airport he was met by RSFSR Foreign Minister V.M. Vinogradov and other officials. SFRY Ambassador to the USSR M. Drulovic was among the welcoming party.

The same day the guest had a conversation at the RSFSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

USSR, SFRY SIGN 1986-1990 COOPERATION PROGRAM

LD210045 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1700 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] A program for scientific-technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia from 1986 to 1990 was signed in Moscow today. Documents were signed by Vsevolod Konyushko, chief of the Scientific and Technical Cooperation With Socialist Countries Administration of the State Committee for Science and Technology, and (Mirko Besevski), deputy director of the Federal International, Scientific, Educational-Cultural, and Technical Cooperation Institute. The documents envisage the expansion and strengthening of scientific-technical contacts between our countries, oriented toward accelerating scientific-technical progress and the [word indistinct] of national economies of our countries.

MOSCOW MEETING MARKS BULGARIAN TREATY DATE

PM201433 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 86 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Treaty Anniversary"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow workers was held on 17 March to mark the 38th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

It was noted in the speeches that the conclusion of the treaty was a glorious page in the annals of relations between the two states. The document has served as a firm foundation for multifaceted fraternal relations in the name of common noble aims -- building socialism and communism and strengthening general peace.

F. Spasov, minister plenipotentiary and counselor at the Bulgarian Embassy in the USSR, said that in the almost 40 years since the treaty was concluded, the relations of good-neighborliness and close cooperation between the Bulgarian and Soviet peoples have been enriched with new ideological and spiritual ties and with specific deeds. The treaty is a guarantee of Bulgaria's constant progress along the path of building developed socialism.

D. Zhulev, Bulgarian ambassador to the USSR, was present.

REPORT ON NATO NUCLEAR PLANNING GROUP MEETING

LD202234 Moscow TASS in English 1801 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Wuerzburg March 20 TASS -- TASS correspondents Vladimir Serov and Sergey Sosnovskiy report: The NATO Nuclear Planning Group opened its spring session in Wuerzburg, West Germany, today. Chaired by NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington, it is being attended by the defense ministers of the bloc's member countries. Greece, Spain and Turkey sent their permanent representatives at the NATO headquarters to the meeting.

The venue of the session, which is being held amid strict secrecy, is sealed off from the outside world by heavy police details and Federal Border Guard Patrols. Commentators take the view that the principal aim of Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger and General James Abrahamson, director of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" organization who also arrived here, will be to draw the allies even deeper into Washington's militarist plans, in particular the ominous "star wars" program.

West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner said in an interview with the local paper MAIN POST that SDI-related issues will be among the main themes of discussions at the session.

Observers believe that Washington's envoys are also going to exert quite an effort to try to discredit the far-reaching blueprint for disarmament, including a plan to eliminate nuclear weapons step by step by the year 2000, which has been proposed by the Soviet Union and won broad international support. The United States will also be prodding the allies into continuing the nuclear arms buildup in Europe.

Weinberger and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl held talks on the eve of the session and are reported by today's press to have agreed in principle about signing an agreement on West German firms' participation in the SDI.

The NATO policy of stepping up military preparations, a course the current meeting in Wuerzburg is called upon to fix even more firmly, is a source of mounting public anxiety and has drawn protests from West German peace forces. The Bavarian branch of the Association of Persons Victimized Under Nazism -- the Union of Anti-Fascists issued a statement urging the government to renounce any involvement in the SDI. "We demand that the Federal Republic of Germany should not sail subserviently in the wake of the U.S. strategy of a first nuclear strike and 'star wars'. A war threat must never again be flowing from German soil," the statement said.

UK, FRG REPORTEDLY UPSET BY U.S. PRESSURE ON SDI

PM191532 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Drobkov "Rejoinder": "Stew With SDI Sauce"]

[Text] Strange events are happening in the upper echelons across the ocean! To start with, Washington's allies were collectively shocked by the Pentagon's demand in the form of an ultimatum that they join the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative." Later on, mesmerized by promises of profits in the billions and "sharing of advanced technology" they, admittedly not so collectively, still fell for the bait of orders for space weapons. Now some West Europeans are complaining increasingly loudly that the transatlantic "clients'" embrace is becoming painfully tight. Matters have reached the point of open expressions of dissatisfaction, even by the allies who were most obliging in the past.

For example, a Pentagon delegation for SDI affairs was urgently recalled almost before it had arrived in Britain. The reason for this was the sharp indignation against the uncereceremonious Yankees, who crudely attempted to dictate their own terms to British firms.

What was at issue was no more and no less than total U.S. control over any research work, and even over the actual British scientists involved with SDI. According to London's THE GUARDIAN, these plans by Washington "could lead to a new political scandal in connection with the extraterritorial application of domestic U.S. laws." Prior to their arrival in Britain, the Pentagon's emissaries encountered the very same hostile reception in a number of other allied countries.

No sooner had the passions aroused by this story cooled down when the alarm was sounded by FRG concerns. It appeared that the West German monopolies, which were just about to divide the spoils of SDI orders, are in jeopardy not only of being overtaken by pushy American competitors, but also of finding themselves in slave-like dependence on the Pentagon. The newspaper WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE complains that the Americans intend to prohibit their future partners from utilizing even the results of research work "which is not directly connected with SDI."

According to the FRG press, U.S. ambitions can be explained by the haste with which the West German chancellor promised to sign the agreement on SDI with Washington "even before the Easter holidays." The SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG writes that the Americans are already exploiting this haste to the utmost for their own purposes. "Despite the fact that Kohl only intended to offer one finger, they intend to uncereceremoniously grab the whole hand," the newspaper concludes. There you have it, a completely accurate description of the Pentagon's appetites. How can one not recall the story about the rabbit which was inordinately flattered by an invitation to dine at the bear's. Arriving at the set hour, the poor guy discovered that he would indeed share the host's table, but in the form of rabbit stew...

Kohl Yields To Pressure

LD202102 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Bonn March 20 TASS -- West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, yielding to U.S. pressure, has actually consented to his country's participation in Washington's plans to prepare for "star wars." That is the way local political observers regard the results of the Wednesday talks between the head of the Bonn cabinet and U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger in Grafenwoehr (Rheinland-Pfalz).

The two sides have reportedly come to terms concerning the conclusion of agreements between the FRG and the USA on the participation of West German firms in SDI research work and on general technological exchanges. Helmut Kohl announced during a press conference that relevant agreements will be signed next week by West German Minister of Economics Martin Bangemann during his visit to Washington.

The head of the Bonn government took this step despite protests from the public and members of political parties, including those belonging to the ruling coalition. Helmut Schaefer, leading foreign policy expert in the Free Democratic Party group in the Bundestag, said that talks with the USA concerning West Germany's participation in the SDI may undermine the Bonn cabinet's prestige in the foreign policy field. He said that in his opinion the Federal Republic should not seek a military agreement with the USA. Olaf Feldmann, also a member of the Free Democratic Party group in the Bundestag, criticised Bonn's undue haste in the matter of the FRG's participation in the "star wars" programme.

UK 'Blindly Following' U.S.

LD201136 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] British Foreign Secretary Howe, speaking in London before foreign journalists, has called the Soviet peace proposals propaganda. Here is a Mayak commentary by Viktor Levin:

From the mouths of stiff-lipped British gentlemen, the word propaganda sounds like bad language. Everything that fails to gratify their tender ears and grates on their refined taste is described as propaganda. Having slapped this label on something, they think there is nothing more to say on the matter. However, the matter concerns an issue of paramount importance; moreover, it must be stressed, of importance both for Britain and for mankind as a whole. The Soviet Union proposes complete elimination of all nuclear weapons in the next 15 years. Our proposals are specific and realistic. Besides, we are not only putting forward an idea which the international public has greeted with enthusiasm, but we are also taking a real step on the way to its implementation. This step is the unilateral introduction by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. We first established this moratorium from 6 August to the end of 1985, then extended it to 31 March. Then last week, in reply to the leaders of the six states, Comrade Gorbachev stated our willingness not to carry out nuclear tests after 31 March, too, until the first nuclear explosion in the United States. Each time, when announcing our decision, we have called on the United States to follow our example and at the same time begin working on a treaty on the complete halting of nuclear testing.

That is to say, we are providing an example of the first step being carried out on the way to the full elimination of nuclear weapons. Howe, however, disparagingly terms these real and highly important actions propaganda. It is known that in those cases where a diplomat is unable to say anything to the point, he tries to move conversation onto a different plane. The British foreign secretary is unable to speak about the Soviet peace initiatives objectively. The government of which he is part is blindly following Washington's course. I would like to recall the words of the foreign minister of another country, also belonging to NATO, which incidentally also very zealously follows Washington: It would be very sad if the Soviet proposals were called propaganda. Genscher, head of the FRG Foreign Ministry said that.

ZAMYATIN REPORTEDLY NEXT SOVIET AMBASSADOR TO UK

LD201453 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1434 GMT 20 Mar 86

[By David Bradshaw, PA political staff]

[Text] Soviet leader Mr Mikhail Gorbachev has appointed a key aide to be the next Soviet ambassador in London. The appointment of 67-year-old Kremlin veteran Mr Leonid Zamyatin will be announced shortly, reliable sources in London confirmed today. He will replace the present ambassador Mr Viktor Popov, who has been in London since 1980. The appointment is almost certain to mean the upgrading of the London post in the growing propaganda war between the Soviet Union and United States.

Mr Zamyatin, a communications expert who is regarded as a hardliner, is at present head of the International Information Division of the powerful Central Committee in Moscow. He played a key role during last year's Geneva summit between Mr Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan, dealing comfortably at press conferences with difficult questions about Soviet policy. The Foreign Office today refused to comment on the reports that Mr Zamyatin would be taking over in London.

FRANCE'S CHIRAC FACES DIFFICULTIES IN NEW GOVERNMENT

LD202218 Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Paris March 20 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reports: Jacques Chirac, leader of the largest French right-wing party, Rally for the Republic, has been named the new prime minister of the country. He has accepted the proposal of President Mitterrand to form and lead a new government. Chirac handed to the president a list of new cabinet ministers.

The president today received the resignation of the cabinet led by Laurent Fabius. The change of government is a result of parliamentary elections on March 16, in which the Socialists suffered a setback and the right-wing forces put together won the majority in the National Assembly.

Local observers note that the protracted talks between the president and Chirac prior to his appointment and the fact that he had spent almost two days in intensive consultations with the leaders of right-wing parties and groupings before finally accepting testify to difficulties faced by the leadership of France as the country enters the period of "cohabitation" of the Socialist head of state and the right-wing parliamentary majority.

According to press reports, during the talks between Mitterrand and Chirac, there have emerged substantial differences between the positions of the sides. Since the right-wing forces have a very slight majority in the National Assembly, Chirac tried to reserve for his cabinet the right to issue governmental decrees on a broad range of issues, primarily social and economic, without parliamentary approval. Mitterrand for his part stressed that the head of state should retain in full his leading role, stipulated by the Constitution, especially in matters of defense and foreign policy. In particular, at the start of the talks he resolutely declined the initial candidatures for the posts of the external relations and defense ministers.

At the same time the democratic press points out that the president's point of view coincides with that of the right-wing majority on a number of economic and social problems. The head of state, L'HUMANITE stresses today, will not block the measures envisioned in the governmental program of the right-wing parties in favour of the interests of big capital, including projects to denationalize state-controlled businesses.

BRITISH AMBASSADOR CARTLEDGE VISITS UZBEKISTAN

GF181626 Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 0215 GMT 18 Mar 86

[Text] Great Britain's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, Bryan George Cartledge, has arrived in Uzbekistan. He has visited the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Academy of Sciences, and the Tashkent State University named after Vladimir Lenin. The guest also toured the Uzbek SSR economic products exhibition and acquainted himself with sites of interest in the Uzbek capital. Comrade Dzhurabekov, first deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers Presidium and chairman of the State Committee for the Agro-Industrial Complex, received Bryan George Cartledge on 17 March.

ALBANIAN GOVERNMENT DEMANDS UK RETURN GOLD

LD192238 Moscow TASS in English 2218 GMT 19 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS -- Albania demands that London return Albanian gold stock which is kept in British money boxes. How did it happen that Albanian gold wound up there and why does London refuse to return it to the legitimate owner?

In the spring of 1945 when the "Third Reich" broke up, the Soviet weekly NEW TIMES relates, Albanian gold was discovered by allied troops in one of salt mines in Germany's south. In keeping with the norms of international law, all the discovered gold the weight of which, according to Albanian press data, is more than 2,454 kilograms was to be returned to the owner. The implementation of this agreement was entrusted to a tripartite commission consisting of representatives of the United States, Britain and France. The commission officially recognised the Albanian Government's legitimate rights to the gold found in Germany.

However, a decision on the return of the gold to Albania was dragged out, and the gold was turned over to Britain for safe-keeping.

Presently London blocked the gold, making use of the so-called Corfu Channel incident: On October 22, 1946, two British destroyers Somarez and Volage struck mines that remained after the war, and sank not far from the Albanian port of Sarande. But what has Albania got to do with that? At that time it had neither sea mines nor craft for planting them.

Albania has repeatedly raised the question of returning the gold belonging to it. However, London up to now replies in the negative. The legitimacy of the demand of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania for the return of the gold belonging to the Albanian people is obvious to any unbiased person.

ITALIAN BUSINESS SPOKESMAN ON JOINT TRADE OUTLOOK

PM181041 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with Emilio Rocchi, secretary general of the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, by M. Ilinskiy under the "IZVESTIYA Interview" rubric: "We Support Cooperation with the USSR" -- date not given]

[Text] Milan -- The 21st General Assembly of the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce [CCIS] has ended work in Milan. Your correspondent asked Emilio Rocchi, secretary general of the CCIS, to comment on its work, role, and significance in the development of Soviet-Italian trade and economic ties.

"Above all I should like to draw attention to the fact," he noted, "that the chamber's present lofty forum was the first meeting between prominent representatives of Italian and Soviet business circles since the 27th CPSU Congress."

The active participation of representatives of Italian business circles in the work of the present CCIS assembly provided further evidence of the chamber's standing and an indication of its useful activity aimed at effectively promoting the development of mutually beneficial trade, economic, and scientific-technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Italy. The number of CCIS members now exceeds 400. And that is far from the limit.

The CPSU Central Committee's Political Report to the 27th congress put forward a Soviet program for safeguarding peace and the peoples' security -- a program which is concrete, realistic, and vital for the fate of the peace. This program and the USSR's other peace-loving proposals meets the aspirations of all progressive mankind. If this program is implemented in full, the international division of labor will undoubtedly receive further positive development. In this connection the Draft Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and the Period Through the Year 2000 envisage considerable expansion of the Soviet Union's economic ties with Western countries. What are the prospects for Italian-Soviet economic and scientific-technical cooperation in this regard?

The year 1985 was a particular "transitional period" between the hiatus in our economic relations which, unfortunately, lasted quite a long time, and development through the conclusion of important business contacts. New opportunities are now opening up. The Draft Basic Guidelines are of undoubted interest for Italian business circles, because that document provides a basis on which to determine the sphere in which Italian-Soviet cooperation is to receive long-term development. And there is a secure basis for that: During talks in Moscow last May, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and B. Craxi, prime minister of Italy; confirmed a readiness to develop and improve trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and Italy. This trade will be on a more balanced basis in accordance with existing long-term agreements, including the 1984 program for strengthening economic, industrial, and technical cooperation through the year 1990.

We have learned from the 27th CPSU Congress documents, E. Rocchi stressed, that the USSR is planning to double its national income and industrial production by the end of the century by means of a sharp increase in labor productivity and changes in its structural policy and to increase national economic efficiency and the Soviet people's prosperity. This will have a positive influence on world trade as a whole and on Italian-Soviet economic ties in particular.

The further development of Italian-Soviet trade, economic, scientific, and technical relations, E. Rocchi said in conclusion, sets the CCIS new and larger scale tasks. We have real reserves for fruitful business cooperation in the power industry, electronics, electrotechnical, agroindustrial, public catering, consumer services, construction, transport, and advertising Soviet and Italian products.

SOVIET ENVOY ON PORTUGAL, U.S. UNITA TIES

LD141646 Lisbon International Service in Portuguese 1200 GMT 14 Mar 86

[Text] The Soviet ambassador in Lisbon has strongly condemned the support lent by Ronald Reagan to UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] and pledged that the Soviet Union wholly backs the legitimate government of Angolan President Jose Eduardo dos Santos.

Addressing a press conference in Lisbon, that was held to appraise the outcome of the 27th CPSU Congress -- a conference which came to be dominated by topics on southern Africa and relations between the USSR and Portugal -- Valentin Vdovin described the U.S. President's stand on aid to Jonas Savimbi as clearly negative because UNITA's aim is to bring down a legitimate government. Vdovin said that his country and Cuba are giving the Angolan Government all their support in the political and economic spheres, as well as assistance to strengthen its Armed Forces against the external aggression -- from UNITA and the South African apartheid regime -- of which Angola is victim.

Answering a question on the matter, Vdovin rejected the South African president's conditional proposal for elections in Namibia, emphasizing that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a matter on which only Angola and Cuba have a say. As for Mozambique, Vdovin argued that the Soviet Union had lost a faithful friend to the United States. The ambassador said his country's relations with Mozambique are still on the ascent, not descent. But, he said, it is up to Mozambique to decide with whom it should make deals and rapports.

Regarding relations between his country and Portugal, the ambassador underscored the importance to his country of Mario Soares' election, importance which could be judged by the composition of the Soviet delegation to the installation of the new president of the Republic. Vdovin described relations between Lisbon and Moscow as normal, after having improved recently. What matters, he said, is that there is mutual interest in seeing our relations developed to a qualitatively higher level.

ECONOMIST CLAIMS WEST 'CREATED' OPEC CRISIS

LD202342 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 20 Mar 86

[(?Andrey Nestrinkov) commentary: "OPEC, For The Success of Work"]

[Text] The conference of OPEC representatives that began on the 16th of this month in order to discuss issues concerning the stability of the oil market is still continuing in Geneva. We asked Soviet economist and scientist (?Andrey Nestrinkov) to comment on the progress of the conference. He wrote the following commentary:

The OPEC oil ministers, who are meeting in Geneva, are facing a complicated mission. The crisis of the oil market, which has struck the Arab oil countries and their allies in the OPEC heavily, is not an accidental market phenomenon. It was created by the policy being continuously applied by the imperialist cartels in order to weaken the positions of the small countries in the international oil trade.

The crisis was immediately preceded by a sharp increase, with the approval of London, in oil production from the North Sea and a sale of a part of the U.S. strategic reserve. These two actions flooded the market, which was already full, and caused a rapid deterioration in prices, which have shrunk to less than half of what they were last December.

The OPEC countries believe the way to stabilize the market and raise prices is to regulate oil production by all the major oil-producing countries. This call was responded to by a number of new oil-producing countries which are not OPEC members. Yesterday, the coordination of oil policies was discussed in a meeting for OPEC countries in which Angola, Malaysia, Egypt, Mexico, and Oman participated.

Adopting a constructive stance, OPEC called for finding a joint language with the Western countries as well. Mani' Ibn Sa'id al-Utaybah, the United Arab Emirates oil minister, said on Tuesday that OPEC needs cooperation of some kind with Britain. Western governments and cartels, which are benefitting from the current crisis, do not want an agreement with OPEC. For instance, the British representative again on Tuesday firmly rejected the possibility of any cooperation with OPEC or any reduction in oil production in the North Sea.

The clear Western hostility toward OPEC presents again very clearly the issue of the unity of the members of this organization. It is no secret that their views are not always the same. This has also become apparent during the current conference. For instance, Algeria and Libya want a reduction in oil production, which will lead to a rapid price increase, while the Gulf countries believe that the cartels will not long be able to combat the competition of cheap Arab oil. Also, it is no secret that the OPEC members have in the past repeatedly violated production quotas they had previously agreed to.

However, disagreements inside OPEC, as many Arab commentators say, should not blur the principal issue that unites them: the joint struggle against the cartels. The Saudi official spokesman said that the best way to avoid disagreements is to strictly implement the quota resolution.

It seems that the OPEC conference will continue until the end of the week. The ministers prefer not to report any tangible results of the meeting as yet. The recommendations of the special experts committee, which was formed on Monday to predict the market situation, are not yet known.

Only one thing is known: The participants in the conference insist on working hard to draw up an agreed upon course against the destructive actions of Western cartels.

SOVIET DELEGATION VISITS VENEZUELAN CONGRESS

PM201104 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Text] Caracas, 18 Mar -- The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Ya. Vagris, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is on an official visit here, visited the Venezuelan congress, where it was received by Leonardo Ferrer, deputy president of the congress. On the delegation's behalf Ya. Vagris thanked the congress leadership for the invitation to visit Venezuela. During the talk, he drew attention to the new large-scale Soviet peace initiatives reflected in the documents of the recent 27th CPSU Congress in Moscow. These initiatives, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed, concern the most important problems of the day -- maintaining peace, ensuring security, and removing the threat of nuclear war. The specific task of eliminating nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons by the end of this century has been set. Vagris pointed to the close interconnection between disarmament and states' economic development. World peace, he noted, is the most importance condition in order to implement the USSR's majestic tasks of economic and social development set by the 27th CPSU Congress. The socioeconomic prosperity of states also depends on world peace. That is why countries -- however small -- must do everything possible to return the planet to the path of the relaxation of international tension. The delegation head expressed satisfaction at the state of Soviet-Venezuelan relations, a great contribution to which is made by constantly expanding parliamentary ties.

L. Ferrer supported the idea that fruitful contacts between the parliamentarians of the USSR and Venezuela are particularly important now that great activeness is required to maintain peace and remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe. He believes that regional conflicts should not have a negative influence on carrying out these vitally important tasks. Venezuela, the congress deputy president noted, makes a high assessment of the proposals put forth by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and further developed at the 27th CPSU Congress. They are being extensively discussed in the Venezuelan parliament. L. Ferrer noted the immense importance of the USSR's proposals for strengthening economic security in the world. These proposals are shared by all developing states encountering problems such as economic crises, huge foreign debts, and the constant growth in unemployment that now extends, on average, to 20 percent of the able-bodied population of Latin America.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation also met with Ruben Carpio Castillo and Osvaldo Alvarez Paz, chairmen of the Senate and chamber of Deputies Commissions for International Policy. An extensive exchange of opinions was held on the most important questions of the day and bilateral relations. The sides expressed their desire to continue to expand and strengthen Soviet-Venezuelan ties for the good of the two countries' peoples. During a ceremony at the Venezuelan National Pantheon the Soviet delegation laid a wreath at the sarcophagus bearing the ashes of Simon Bolivar, a true son of the Venezuelan people and a fighter to liberate the Latin American countries from Spanish dominion.

COSTA RICA DENIES SOVIET EXTRADITION REQUEST

PA192240 Paris AFP IN Spanish 2124 GMT 19 Mar 86

[Excerpt] San Jose, 19 Mar (AFP) -- The Costa Rican Government today refused, due to faulty presentation, an extradition request presented by the Soviet Union for Ukrainian Bogdan Koziy, 62 who has been described as a "Nazi war criminal." Costa Rican Foreign Minister Carlos Jose Gutierrez has sent a note to the Soviet Embassy in San Jose saying that the Soviet extradition request for Koziy, dated 13 March, "cannot be accepted" because it does not meet the legal and formal requirements. Gutierrez said that his office only receives the requests, and only the tribunals can make a decision about the contents of the requests. Costa Rica and the Soviet Union do not have an extradition treaty, but the request for Koziy could follow its due course if the Soviet Embassy again presents its request according to Costa Rican law.